NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY

215

ROLL

31

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 31

October 6, 1924 - June 6, 1927

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 31

The three volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1924 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; (2) "Minutes / 1925 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; and (3) "Minutes / 1926 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 6, 1924, to June 6, 1927.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 6, 1924, to June 8, 1925; the second, from October 5, 1925, to June 7, 1926; and the third, from October 4, 1926, to June 6, 1927.

2992

VOLUME

1924

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1924.

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 6th day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-four and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-ninth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles T. Rowland, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Erwin M. Freusch, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Vilas, It is ordered that Dana T. Ackerly, Esquire, of New York City,

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Snyder, It is ordered that Harold B. Elgar, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Henry D. Goldberg, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Timothy J. Mahoney, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, It is ordered that James T. Crouch, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Samuel C. Coleman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Murphy, It is ordered that Oscar C. Thomas, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted to practice.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that Walter T. Kinder, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted to practice.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that George J. Chryssikos, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that James P. Wood, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Morris Bien, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace S. Whitman, It is ordered that W. Ainsworth Parker, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Merritt U. Hayden, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Samuel Block, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Homer N. Boardman, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney And Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Loveland, It is ordered that Joseph Tuttle Stearns, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. L. Smith, It is ordered that Lawrence E. Ensor, Esquire, of Towson, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. L. Smith, It is ordered that William P. Cole, Jr., Esquire, of Towson, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben J. Gibson, It is ordered that Neill Garrett, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Louis B. LeDuc, Esquire, of Haddonfield, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush D. Holland, It is ordered that Enid Childs, ~~Esquire~~, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Harry F. Payer, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that Margaret T. Lynch, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that Humphrey J. Lynch, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh, It is ordered that Irving Miller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Fowler, It is ordered that Helen M. Cirese, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Louis H. Winch, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Archibald Douglas, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Edward Holloway, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Loveland, It is ordered that Joseph Tuttle Stearns, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. L. Smith, It is ordered that Lawrence E. Ensor, Esquire, of Towson, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. L. Smith, It is ordered that William P. Cole, Jr., Esquire, of Towson, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben J. Gibson, It is ordered that Neill Garrett, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Louis B. LeDuc, Esquire, of Haddonfield, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush D. Holland, It is ordered that Enid Childs, ~~Esquire~~, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Harry F. Payer, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that Margaret T. Lynch, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that Humphrey J. Lynch, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh, It is ordered that Irving Miller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Fowler, It is ordered that Helen M. Cirese, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Louis H. Winch, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Archibald Douglas, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Edward Holloway, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace S. Whitman, It is ordered that William H. Maynard, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Milverton, It is ordered that Matthew Westrate, Esquire, of Muscatine, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Harry S. Hall, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Cornelius Lynde, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert Howson, It is ordered that Frank J. Kent, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Harry E. O'Neill, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Willard P. McBain, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel H. Kirby, It is ordered that George E. Diessen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Jesse A. Holton, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the following cases, viz: Nos. 161, 212, 236, 285 (and 287), 258, 207 (and 299), 104 (and 105 and 106), 320, 277 (and 278 and 279 and 280), 162, 283, 343, 412, 351, 81, 272, 401, 191 (and 192 and 193), 181, 342, 3 Original, 12 Original, 338, 353, 25 (and 26), 332 (and 333, 334 and 335), 423, 316, and 402, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 10th next, be, and they are hereby, reassigned for Monday, November 17th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant,

14, vs.
Original.
The State of Washington.

The stipulation as to the decree in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Walter D. Sweeney, Claimant etc.,
Appellant,

18. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce,
Plaintiff in Error,
28. vs.
The Intercity Radio Company, Inc.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
56. vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John M. Perry and Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
391. vs.
Joseph Weissman et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

Samuel Gross, Petitioner,
398. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed, and this cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the respondent,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here or-

dered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Alexander Milburn Company, Petitioner, vs. Davis-Bournonville Company. 472.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Save Electric Corporation, Petitioner, vs. General Electric Company. 508.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, Appellant, vs. Mally S. Daugherty. 596.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. O. B. Fish. 653.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan R. Brown for the respondent.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Weissman et al. 391.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Slade for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. E. Vander Zyl. 110.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel M. McClean et al., Petitioners,
641. vs.
M. A. Bradley et al.

Leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file a brief herein in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, within one week.

United Fuel Gas Company, Appellant,
669. vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the appellant.

W. L. Stickel, Plaintiff in Error,
218. vs.
Big Laurel Coal Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Maynard F. Stiles for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
371. vs.
Department of Public Works of the State of Washington et al.

Walter B. Whitcomb, successor to Hance H. Cleland as Supervisor of Public Utilities and Member of the Department of Public Works of the State of Washington, was substituted as a party defendant in error herein, on motion of Mr. J. H. Carroll in that behalf.

Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Fort Worth,
Appellant,
487. vs.
W. W. Wilkerson et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark McMahon for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Boynton for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway
224. vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. John W. Price, of counsel for the Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this certificate, which has been heretofore dismissed in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that this certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Maryland Railway Company, Petitioner,
647. vs.
M. M. and D. D. Brown, Partners etc.

Western Maryland Railway Company, Petitioner,
648. vs.
M. M. and D. D. Brown, Partners etc.

Leave was granted counsel for the respondents to file a brief herein in opposition to the petition for writs of certiorari within two weeks, on motion of Mr. John A. Kratz in that behalf.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion of The People of the State of Illinois for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was granted; and the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein was denied, on motion of Mr. George E. Diessen.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion of the Chicago Association of Commerce for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was granted; and the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein was denied; on motion of Mr. Cornelius Linde.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

The motions of The State of Tennessee, The State of Missouri, The State of Louisiana, and The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce et al. for leave to file briefs herein as amici curiae were granted, on motion of Mr. Daniel M. Kirby in that behalf. Consideration of the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein, submitted by Mr. Daniel M. Kirby in that behalf, was postponed until the hearing of the case.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
23, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. John Walsh for the defendant, leave was granted to file an answer herein.

Max Wulfsohn et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
65. vs.
Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Recht for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Otto C. Sommerich and Mr. Edwin M. Borchard for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

John H. Hendriks, Petitioner,
664. vs.
Atlas Land Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ed. P. Ingham for the petitioner.

Auditore Contracting Company, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
1. vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

This cause was continued, per stipulation, on motion of Mr. D. M. Tibbetts in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of Kingston Dry Dock & Construction Company, Inc., —, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. M. Tibbetts and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
576. vs.
National Biscuit Company.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amici curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Willard P. McBain in that behalf.

Ivory Novelties Trading Company, Inc., Petitioner,
38. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

This cause was continued, per stipulation, on motion of Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in that behalf.

F. A. Cooke, Plaintiff in Error,
295. vs.
Morgan's Louisiana and Texas R.R. & Steamship Company et al.

The motion of defendants in error to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

DeWitt T. Law, Plaintiff in Error,
550. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al., Appellants,
678. vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

The motion as to the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph H. Jones for the appellants.

Charles Marx, Executor, Plaintiff in Error,
523. vs.
Elizabeth Reinecke.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence E. Ensor and Mr. William P. Cole, Jr., for the appellee.

In the matter of the Petition of East River Towing Company, Inc., for Limitation of Liability of the Steam Tug "Edward", her Engines, etc.,

81. (CERTIFICATE).

On motion of Mr. Samuel C. Coleman in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

Steamship "Willdomino", her Engines, Boilers, etc.,

Petitioner,

631. vs.

Citro Chemical Company of America.

Steamship "Willdomino", her Engines, Boilers, etc.,

Petitioner,

632. vs.

Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

Convoy Steamship Company, Ltd., Owner of the Steamship "Willdomino", her Engines, Boilers, etc.,

Petitioner,

633. vs.

Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. J. M. Chamberlin in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Appellant,

22. vs.

Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa, et al.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,

Appellant,

23. vs.

Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa, et al.

The motions to continue these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the appellant in No. 23 and in behalf of counsel for the appellant in No. 22, and the motions were denied. The motions to dismiss in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben J. Gibson and Mr. Neill Garrett for the appellees in support of the motion.

Oliver Bower, Petitioner,

374. vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. E. Dadmun for the petitioner.

Alaska Electric Light & Power Company, Petitioner, 380. vs. The City of Juneau et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert W. Jennings for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal for the respondents.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant, 388. vs. The City of Cleburne et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Washington Bowie, Jr., for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. E. B. Perkins for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Serena G. Levy, Petitioner, 390. vs. S. H. Kress & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ed S. Vaught, Mr. P. D. Brewer, and Mr. J. H. Everest for the respondent.

John C. Ross, Plaintiff in Error, 396. vs. The State of South Dakota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. U. S. G. Cherry and Mr. Holton Davenport for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Byron S. Payne for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Ralph Sabbatino et al., Petitioners, 399. vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander S. Drescher for the petitioners.

Edward S. Huff, Petitioner, 400. vs. Henry Ford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., Mr.

T. T. Ansberry, Mr. George T. Farrell, and Mr. John M. Murrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Kay, Mr. Frank B. Shutts, and Mr. H. H. Emmons for the respondent.

The State of Arkansas ex rel. J. S. Utley, Attorney General etc., for use of Craighead County, Arkansas,
Plaintiff in Error,
410. vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Utley for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. William J. Orr, Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. Edward L. Westbrooke, for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Elkton Electric Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
416. vs.
Thomas W. Perkins et al., Receivers etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred R. Williams for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. E. P. Keech, Jr., for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

St. Bernard Cypress Company, Limited,
Petitioner,
419. vs.
Louis Pfister.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Milling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin T. Waldo for the respondent.

Pacific Rice Growers Association et al.,
Petitioners,
424. vs.
Lake Charles Rice Milling Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. K. Bonestell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. McCoy for the respondent.

H. W. Swender, Petitioner, vs. Walter V. Empie. 428. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kenneth E. Matot for the petitioner.

Winthrop Smith, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 431. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard Biel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

J. H. Leverkuhn, alias Jack Leverkuhn, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 434. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Kahn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. Radio Corporation of America. 435. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. F. H. Betts for the respondent.

John A. Grogan, Collector etc., Petitioner, vs. Bryant Walker, Executor etc. 437. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. E. Spalding for the respondent.

Baird Rubber & Trading Company, Inc., Petitioner,
445. vs.
George D. Bates, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse P. Dice for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Smoyer for the respondent.

William J. Dolloff, Petitioner,
448. vs.
Steam Tug "Charlotte", etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence E. Coffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray M. Stanley for the respondents.

Walter Ray Simmons, Petitioner,
449. vs.
William R. Fenton, Warden etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. P. Holmes and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

Walter Ray Simmons, Petitioner,
450. vs.
The State of Nebraska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. P. Holmes and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
451. vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
452. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
453. vs.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the appellants in support of the petition, and by Mr. W. P. Dickinson, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Alexander E. Horn, and Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the appellee in No. 451; by Mr. Charles O.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
454. vs.
Northern States Power Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
455. vs.
The City of Sioux Falls.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc., Appellants,
456. vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

Bailey, Mr. H. H. Field, Mr. J. H. Voorhees, and Mr. T. M. Bailey for the appellee in No. 452; by Mr. Charles O. Bailey, Mr. R. L. Kennedy, Mr. J. H. Voorhees, and Mr. R. M. Bailey for the appellee in No. 453; by Mr. John H. Roemer and Mr. H. M. Campbell for the appellee in No. 454; by Mr. Charles O. Bailey, Mr. J. H. Voorhees, and Mr. T. M. Bailey for the appellee in No. 455, and by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the appellee in No. 456, in opposition thereto.

American Express Company, Aktieselskab,
Petitioner,
457. vs.
The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Hexie".

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Milburn for the petitioner.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway,
Plaintiffs in Error,
458. vs.
Bernice S. Graham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Prendergast and Mr. George Thompson for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Charles H. Tynan, Petitioner,
459. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert W. Jennings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
462. vs.
Ezra A. Sliger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Sheean and Mr. George E. Hamilton for the petitioner.

Oscar W. Uhrich et al., Copartners etc., Petitioners,
463. vs.
The Van Kannel Revolving Door Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Kennedy Helm, Mr. Edmund F. Trabue, Mr. John C. Doolan, and Mr. Richard H. Hill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell and Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
464. vs.
William F. Regan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore Kiendl for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. DeLacey and Mr. Humphrey J. Lynch for the respondent.

Saint Louis Union Trust Company, Petitioner,
466. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 3 of Van Buren County, Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. F. Loughborough, and Mr. A. W. Dobyns for the petitioner.

M. B. Penton, Petitioner,
467. vs.
New Orleans and Northeastern Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Gex for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. A. S. Bozeman, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, for the respondent.

Des Moines Wholesale Grocer Company, Petitioner,
468. vs.
William C. Fraser, Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horatio F. Dale and Mr. William G. Harvison for the petitioner.

The Alexander Milburn Company, Petitioner, 472. vs. Davis-Bournonville Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Watson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the respondent.

Kentucky Coke Company, Petitioner, 473. vs. Keystone Gas Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew O'Doherty for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Martin for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, 474. vs. J. W. C. Bell, Jr., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Wiley and Mr. Edgar B. Kingsworthy for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. P. Feazel for the respondent.

R. H. Clements et al., Petitioners, 483. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Stevenson and Mr. Oscar J. Horn for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Alfred H. Cowles, Petitioner, 492. vs. Franz A. Rody. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Seymour for the petitioner.

Globe Indemnity Company, Petitioner, 493. vs. Sulpho Saline Bath Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. W. Ireland for the petitioner.

Postum Cereal Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
497. vs.
California Fig Nut Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. William J. Hughes, Mr. Frank F. Reed, and Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., for the appellant in support of the petition.

Mrs. Margaret G. Lawrence,
Petitioner,
499. vs.
Atlantic Paper & Pulp Corporation, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Isaac for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., Mr. A. B. Lovett, and Mr. Alvan B. Rowe for the respondent.

Samuel C. Lawrence, Petitioner,
500. vs.
Atlantic Paper & Pulp Corporation, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Isaac for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., Mr. A. B. Lovett, and Mr. Alvan B. Rowe for the respondent.

Millers Indemnity Underwriters,
Plaintiff in Error,
502. vs.
Mrs. Nellie Boudreaux Braud, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill and Mr. Hannis Taylor, Jr., for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

John H. McCallum et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
503. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the respondent.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The Plisson Steam Navigation Company, Limited, Owner of the Steamship "Nivose". 504.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the respondent.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Natale Suttore, Master etc., et al. 505.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Forbes for the respondent.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Erik Fingalsen, Master etc., et al. 506.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall for the petitioner.

Save Electric Corporation, Petitioner, vs. General Electric Company. 508.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Hubert Howson, and Mr. Albert F. Davis for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Joe Shaw, next friend of Lee Shear She, Petitioner, vs. W. L. James, Master etc., et al. 510.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner.

Charles Broadway Rouss, Inc., Petitioner,
512. vs.
The Winchester Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hart Anderson and Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner, and by Mr. Archibald Cox for the respondent.

J. E. Hamilton, Petitioner,
513. vs.
The Empire Gas & Fuel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Joseph D. Houston, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, Mr. Claude I. Depew, and Mr. W. E. Stanley for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. O. Caster, Mr. Robert Stone, and Mr. Albert F. Davis for the respondents.

E. A. Shriver et al., Petitioners,
514. vs.
The Empire Gas & Fuel Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Joseph D. Houston, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, Mr. Claude I. Depew, and Mr. W. E. Stanley for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. O. Caster for the respondents.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
515. vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jonah J. Goldstein for the respondents.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
516. vs.
Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jonah J. Goldstein for the respondents.

Douglas A. Conklin, Petitioner,
517. vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Mann for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
518. vs.
M. M. Cohn Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Wiley and Mr. Edgar B. Kinsworthy for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Hendricks for the respondent.

Mobile & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
519. vs.
C. M. Wood.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marion Riley for the respondent.

Cora Schuler et al., etc., Petitioners,
520. vs.
Wilhelmine Ohlendiek.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard Garver, Jr., and Mr. David Lorbach for the petitioners, and by Mr. Simeon M. Johnson for the respondent.

Clifford C. Emmich, Petitioner,
521. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Dolle and Mr. Simeon M. Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

William H. Edwards, Collector etc., Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by

Mr. Matthew C. Fleming and Mr. Paul Armitage for the respondent.

Parfums DeGrande Luxe, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
530. vs.
Coty, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank M. Halstead for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugo Mock and Mr. Asher Blum for the respondent.

Elmina L. Burget, Petitioner,
531. vs.
C. M. Cranston et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. L. Burget for the petitioner.

Mercantile Bank of The Americas, Inc., Petitioner,
532. vs.
Steamship "General G. W. Goethals", etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D.Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the respondents.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner,
533. vs.
M. A. Pharr Cotton Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bryan Cumming for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edgar Watkins, Mr. Mac Isaac, and Mr. C. B. Sutton for the respondent.

Charles Gunther, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
535. vs.
The Home Insurance Company of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Duncan Bradley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lowndes Maury and Mr. R. F. Gaines for the respondents.

Armour & Company, Petitioner,
537. vs.
Fort Morgan Steamship Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioner.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
541. vs.
Galbreath Cattle Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. E. E. Enterline for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
553. vs.
P. O. Warrick.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vincent M. Miles and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel R. Chew for the respondent.

General American Tank Car Corporation, Petitioner,
555. vs.
B. K. Goree, Receiver of Home Oil Refining Company of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. H. Barrow, Jr., and Mr. George E. Price for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
557. vs.
Hettie McCree.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Walter Dohany, Mr. Alexander L. Smith, and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. H. W. Fraser and Mr. P. R. Taylor for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The St. Louis, Brownsville and Mexico Railway Company, Petitioner,
558. vs.
American Fruit Growers, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Green and Mr. Frank Andrews for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Leahy, Mr. Walter H. Saunders, and Mr. Lambert E. Walther for the respondent.

Robert F. Raine, Petitioner,
559. vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sardis Summerfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Alfred Street, suing on behalf of himself and all other Seamen, etc., Petitioner,
560. vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. F. Sullivan, Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. A. Crawford Greene for the respondents.

Hypania Transportation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
561. vs.
Steam Lighter "Sagamore" et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Gifford and Mr. Wilson B. Brice for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith and Mr. Theodore L. Bailey for the respondents.

Delia Salzer, Plaintiff in Error,
564. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Fleming Walsh for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Canton Company of Baltimore et al., Petitioners,
567. vs.
Andrew B. Brown, as Master of the Steamship "Santa Barbara"

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall for the petitioner.

Continental National Bank, Petitioner,
568. vs.
William H. Moore, Jr., Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Poorman, Jr., for the petitioner.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
569. vs.
Paul L. Tustison.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, of the State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe M. Ewing for the respondent.

Samuel O. Lazarus et al., Petitioners,
570. vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. Arthur W. Clement, and Mr. George E. Hargrave for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Mann for the respondent.

Peter P. McDonough and Harry Rice, Petitioners,
572. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth, Mr. Charles J. Hoggerty, and Mr. W. D. Riter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Leon Hurwitz, Petitioner,
574. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James T. Lloyd for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
576. vs.
National Biscuit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. H. Fuller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Vilas, Mr. George E. Shaw, and Mr. William C. Breed for the respondent.

John Beartail et al., Petitioners,
577. vs.
Pauline P. Halsell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elias J. Van Court for the petitioners.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
579. vs.
Henrietta Martin, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. R. Turney, Mr. A. H. Kiskaddon, and Mr. W. T. Wooldridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Nathan Hall for the respondent.

C. E. Schaff, as Receiver etc.,
Petitioner,
580. vs.
Mrs. Beerah Ridlehuber, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson and Mr. C. S. Burg for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. B. Williams for the respondent.

Marine Smokeless Coal Company, Petitioner,
582. vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of McDowell County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Shelton for the petitioner.

Velma Pinnell, Petitioner,
585. vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allyn Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. F. Evans and Mr. E. T. Miller for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
586. vs.
Harry L. Kast.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe M. Ewing for the respondent.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
587. vs.
John J. Flechtner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe M. Ewing for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
588. vs.
Byron Robertson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Luther Day for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
591. vs.
The Trenton Potteries Company

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of

the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. V. Lindabury, Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach, and Mr. H. Snowden Marshall for the respondent.

Rolph Navigation & Coal Company, Owner etc., of the Barkentine "Rolph", Petitioner,

592. vs.

Demetrius Kohilas et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondents.

Mercantile Trust Company, Petitioner,

595. vs.

John F. Schlafly, Trustee of Temtor Corn & Fruit Products Company, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Mitchell and Mr. S. L. Swarts for the petitioner, and by Mr. James C.Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the respondent.

James Denaro, Petitioner,

601. vs.

American Cone & Wafer Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes and Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert E. Dieterich and Mr. Frederick A. Tennant for the respondent.

Security Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,

602. vs.

Supreme Manufacturing Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ford W. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. William K. White for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
603. vs.
Emanuel Gross.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert C. Wall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Carey for the respondent.

The Reading Company, Petitioner,
604. vs.
Marius Nielsen & Son, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Lazenby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
605. vs.
Marius Nielsen & Son, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Lazenby for the petitioner.

National Security Company, Petitioner,
606 & 607. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Griffin and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner.

Lydia Steamship Company, Claimant etc., et al., Petitioners,
608 & 609. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alvin C. Cass for the petitioners.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
610. vs.
Arthur Gifford et al., Copartners etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lauritz Miller for the respondents.

A. W. Pickford et al., as the Creditors' Committee of Empire Tire & Rubber Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Arthur H. Wood, as Sole Acting Receiver of Empire Tire & Rubber Corporation. 611.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Noble and Mr. Hartwell P.Heath for the petitioner, and by Mr. John R. Hardin and Mr. Corwin Howell for the respondent.

The Boylston National Bank of Boston, Petitioner, vs. David W. Wainhouse et al. 612.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic Gilbert Bauer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Goldberg for the respondents.

William Locke Paddon, Petitioner, vs. Una Margaret Locke Paddon. 614.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter C. Clephane and Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer for the petitioner.

Nickolaos D. Zahadeires, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 615.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner.

Fred E. Earles et al., Petitioners, vs. A. W. Drake Manufacturing Company et al. 616.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

Frank Kepl, Petitioner,
617. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted by Mr. Dale D. Drain for the petitioner.

Ernest E. Marks Company et al., Petitioners,
618. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David D. Stansbury for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the respondent.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
619. vs.
A. J. Mullens.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Wyoming County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. T. Hall, Mr. C. A. Wingfield, and Mr. W. H. T. Loyall for the petitioner.

W. R. Freeman et al., as Receivers of The Denver & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner,
620. vs.
George Grove.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton Smith, Mr. Charles R. Brock, Mr. Elmer R.Brock, and Mr. E. R. Campbell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Barnwell S. Stuart for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent, Petitioner,
621. vs.
Northern Industrial Chemical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Willis Blackman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee M. Friedman and Mr. Louis B. King for the respondent.

Sovereign Camp of the Woodmen of the World,

Petitioner,

623. vs.

Alice C. Shelton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of Frio County, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the petitioner,

Duplex Derouen, Bankrupt,

Petitioner,

625. vs.

Southwest Louisiana Farm Mortgage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. McCoy for the respondent.

Benjamin Franklin Purnell et al.,

Petitioners,

626. vs.

John W. Hansel and Margaret Hansel, his wife.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Barnard and Mr. H. T. Dewhirst for the petitioners.

The Commonwealth-Atlantic National Bank of Boston,

627. Petitioner,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Probate Court of the County of Middlesex, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles O. Pengra for the petitioner.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland,

Petitioner,

628. vs.

Bank of Waterproof.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Purnell M. Milner for the petitioner.

Eva M. Sowers, Petitioner,

630. vs.

L.E.Kenworthy et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted by Mr. W. R. Ramsey for the petitioner.

Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines etc.,

Petitioner,

631. vs.

Citro Chemical Company of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. Joseph W. Henderson, Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. George B. Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the respondent.

Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines etc.,

Petitioner,

632. vs.

Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. Joseph W. Henderson, Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. George C. Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the respondent.

Convoy Steamship Company, Limited, Owner of the Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines, Boilers etc.,

Petitioner,

633. vs.

Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. Joseph W. Henderson, Mr. George Whitefield, Betts, Jr., and Mr. George C. Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the respondent.

Great Western Power Company of California,

Petitioner,

634. vs.

Milton Bernard, Trustee of Pacific Alloy and Steel Company, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nat Schmulowitz for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Metson for the respondent.

George Harrison, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Western Rope & Manufacturing Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Anna B. Chamberlain. 635.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Mitchell and Mr. Philip Kates for the petitioner.

Richard H. Field, Petitioner, vs. The Kansas City Refining Company et al. 637.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard H. Field for the petitioner.

G. L. Coleman, Petitioner, vs. W. T. Apple. 640.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Dean, Mr. Harry W. Colmery, and Mr. A. Scott Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward E. Sapp for the respondent.

Samuel N. McClean et al., Petitioners, vs. M. A. Bradley et al. 641.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe M. Ewing for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. H. Tolles and Mr. John F. Wilson for the respondents.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc. 642.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, Late Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
643. vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the respondent.

Petrona Lim and Eugenio Evangelista,
Petitioner,
644. vs.
Tomas Cabigao.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Antonio M. Opisso and Mr. James M. Sheridan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the respondent.

Western Maryland Railway Company,
Petitioner,
647. vs.
M. M. and D. D. Brown, Partners etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Randolph County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. A. Bowers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the respondents.

Cities Fuel & Power Company,
Petitioner,
646. vs.
Joseph Button et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Gay, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, Mr. Benjamin V. Becker, Mr. Lewis C. Williams, and Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the respondents.

Western Maryland Railway Company,
Petitioner,
648. vs.
M. M. and D. D. Brown, Partners etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Randolph County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. A. Bowers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the respondents.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
654. vs.
H. L. Smith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. D. Gresham for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Ernest A. Brady et al., Petitioners,
657. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Roscoe Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The First National Bank of Boston, Petitioner.
659.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Probate Court of Essex County, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Farringer and Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the petitioner.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
663. vs.
The A. F. Thomson Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. N. Davis for the petitioner.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
666. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Ellsworth Mason, Petitioner,
670. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellsworth Mason for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondents.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey.
Appellant,
6. vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pecos Water Users' Association,
Appellant,
9. vs.
L. A. Swigart et al., Commissioners etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steel Producers Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
27. vs.
The Wilkoff Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here or-

dered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Freiberg Mahogany Company,
Appellant,
97. vs.
Biorn Bjornstad & Company of Christian, Norway, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dane County, Wisconsin, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
188. vs.
Charles H. Tyler et al., etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Australia et al.,
Petitioners,
208. vs.
John L. McLean, as Trustee in Bankruptcy etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered

and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, with prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sumner Sollitt Company,
Petitioner,
355. vs.
Anna Belle Ellison, etc., et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
422. vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Edmund Ludwig Ring, deceased.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or transfer to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Asa G. Briggs for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

James C. Davis, the Agent under Section 206, Transportation Act, 1920,
Plaintiff in Error,
557. vs.
Hettie McCree.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Fraser for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. Walter Dohany, Mr. Alexander L. Smith, and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

First National Bank of Council Bluffs, Iowa, etc.,
Appellant,
2. vs.
J. D. Hannan, County Auditor, etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
4. vs.
James Rock.
defendant in error.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Van Dame for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William C. Todd for the de-

Railroad & Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota et al.,
16. vs. Appellants,
The Duluth Street Railway Company.

This cause was continued.

Frank Gonsalves, Appellant,
3. vs.
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph Larocque for the appellant, and by Mr. Charles J. McDermott for the appellee.

C. N. Love et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
12. vs.
James S. Griffith et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. D. Evans for the plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

Savage Arms Corporation,
Appellant,
13. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson, It is ordered that Lyman E. Dodge, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Louis J. Canepa, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Richard T. Evans, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, It is ordered that Claro M. Recto, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Froe, It is ordered that Henry Heath, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Nathaniel F. Breen, Esquire, of Watertown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Stone, It is ordered that William J. Donovan, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that H. R. Wilcox, Esquire, of Watertown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, Appellant,
21. vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
29. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
39. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was passed, per stipulation, on motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the petitioner.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
22. vs.
Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa, et al.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Appellant,
23. vs.
Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Donald Evans for the appellant in No. 22; continued by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the appellant in No. 23; by Mr. Ben J. Gibson for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the appellant in No. 23. Leave was granted counsel for the appellants to file briefs herein within ten days, with leave to counsel for the appellees to file a reply thereto within one week thereafter.

Claude E. Barnes,
Plaintiff in Error,
36. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nathaniel F. Breen for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works, Ltd., Plaintiff in Error,
37. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. A. S. Gilbert for the plaintiff in error.

Endicott-Johnson Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
41. vs.
Encyclopedia Press, Inc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Maurice E. Page for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Thomas B. Merchant for the defendant in error.

James Shewan & Sons, Inc.,
Appellant,
42. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Stone, It is ordered that William J. Donovan, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Stevenson, It is ordered that E. L. Stapp, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that D. Basil O'Connor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that W. R. L. Taylor, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Stone, It is ordered that Jerome Michael, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Stone, It is ordered that Paul Shipman Andrews, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Foote, It is ordered that Benjamin D. Holt, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Wood, It is ordered that Edgar M. Powers, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Farrell, It is ordered that Dudley K. Henderson, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that J. Verser Conner, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. L. Allen, It is ordered that J. Raymond Gordon, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas Agnello et al.,
Petitioners,
45. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Swagar Sherley for the petitioner, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond, Snyder & Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
Baltimore Grain Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. W. Ainsworth Parker in that behalf, It is ordered that these cases be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
29. vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that the order of dismissal entered herein on October 7th be, and the same is hereby, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket.

It is further ordered that the record in this cause be printed, and the cause submitted on briefs within thirty days.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Plaintiff in Error,
44. vs.
George D. Henderson.
defendant in error.

This cause was submitted by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the

Joshua W. Miles, formerly United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland,
Plaintiff in Error,
53. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
54. vs.
R. L. Hanna.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur L. Adams for the respondent.

James Shewan & Sons, Inc., Appellant,
42. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee.

The Ferries Company, Appellant,
46. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. R. L. Taylor for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

The United States of America
47. vs.
Steamship "Coamo", Her Engines etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Otis for The United States of America, and by Mr. Ray Rood Allen for Steamship "Coamo", Her Engines etc.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
51. vs.
Martin Kirkendall.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin D. Holt for the petitioner, continued by Mr. D. K. Henderson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Edward A. Foote for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1924.-

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. H. Loomis, It is ordered that John C. Travis, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. H. Loomis, It is ordered that John O. Yeiser, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Edward Petrillo, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, It is ordered that Maud Fellheimer, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, It is ordered that Laura H. Halsey, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, It is ordered that H. Helen Epstein, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, It is ordered that John F. Lundquist, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that John Dale, Esquire, of Vidalia, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly..

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. S. Harby, It is ordered that Ralph D. Epps, Esquire, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Gaston Louis Porterie, Esquire, of Marksville, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Andrew Bradford Booth, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that William McElwee, Jr., Esquire, of New Castle, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that James W. Rhodes, Esquire, of New Castle, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer J. Binford, It is ordered that John C. Kramer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer J. Binford, It is ordered that David H. Hopkins, Esquire, of Cleveland, Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James G. Martin, It is ordered that Ernest S. Merrill, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that J. Philip Clifford, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McPhaul, It is ordered that Clarence G. Fisher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McPhaul, It is ordered that Mary Grace McVey, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

National Surety Company, Petitioner,

606 & vs.
607.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, et al.

Lydia Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Lydia", Her Engines etc., Petitioner,

608 & vs.
609.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, et al.

On motion of Mr. J. H. Billery in behalf of counsel for the respondents, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondents herein within two weeks.

Ex parte In the matter of Ralph Tincher,

——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioner.

Southern Camp, Woodmen of the World, Appellant,

58. vs.

E. E. O'Neill et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. D. Gresham for the appellant. No appearance was filed for the appellees.

Edward P. Avent, Jr., Plaintiff in Error,

52. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank E. Wood for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the defendant in error.

B.

Louis Mackenzie, Petitioner,
55. vs.
A. Englehard & Sons Company.

A. Englehard & Sons Company, Petitioner,
59. vs.
Louis B. Mackenzie.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for Louis B. Mackenzie, continued by Mr. J. Verser Conner for A. Engelhard & Sons Company, and concluded by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for Louis B. Mackenzie.

J. H. Hines Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
57. vs.
Amet Guillot, Sheriff etc.,et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John Dale for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Wolfe Bikle, It is ordered that George Hay Kain, Esquire, of York, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Walter Allen Dane, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Quinton, It is ordered that I. V. McPherson, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice E. Page, It is ordered that Mce Goldstein, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. S. Harby, It is ordered that R. O. Purdy, Esquire, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. S. Harby, It is ordered that David D. Moise, Esquire, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sumter Gas & Power Company,
Appellant,
76. vs.
The City of Sumter et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. G. L. B. Rivers, of counsel for the appellant, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation and motion of counsel for the respective parties to remand this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation and motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with direction to dismiss the bill without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
67. vs.
Western Crawford Road Improvement District.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Harry P. Warner, Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. W. F. Evans, and Mr. Edward J. White for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. E. L. Matlock for the defendant in error.

David W. Sweydon, Petitioner,
69. vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. Albert C. Whittaker, etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for failure to

J. H. Hines Company, Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
57. vs.
Amet Guillot, Sheriff etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John Dale for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. G. L. Porterie for the defendant in error.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
60. vs.
J. M. Currie.

This cause was argued by Mr. Douglas McKay for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. D. Jennings for the respondent.

Fred N. Crouch, Guardian etc., Plaintiff in Error,
61. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James G. Martin for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. E. S. Merrill for the plaintiff in error. Leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file an additional brief herein within one week.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
63. vs.
John O'Hara.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. A. Magaw for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John O. Yeiser for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1924.-

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that C. W. Middlekauff, Esquire, of Freeport, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Robert H. Montgomery, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that J. Marvin Haynes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Chester J. McGuire, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Thaddeus Greene Benton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter, It is ordered that Walter Bernard Gibbons, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter, It is ordered that Harry C. Kohlhas, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter, It is ordered that William H. Whitaker, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter, It is ordered that Charles A. Donnelly, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard M. Long, It is ordered that George S. Wolbert, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin L. Wilson, It is ordered that Arthur C. Keefer, Esquire, of Mt. Rainier, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin L. Wilson, It is ordered that Needham C. Turnage, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Dennis, It is ordered that Stanley H. Udy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Charles E. Kern, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Rollin E. Gish, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that John V. Campbell, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank M. Swacker, It is ordered that Francis I. Fallon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., It is ordered that Allen S. Olmsted, 2nd, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, St.Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Company, Wiggins Ferry Company, et al.,

Appellants,

115. vs.

The United States of America, Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,

127. vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States, Complainant,

14, Original. vs.

The State of Washington.

It is ordered by this Court that the stipulation as to the decree in this cause be, and the same is hereby, approved.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1924.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
v.
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.
} No. 14—Original.

STIPULATION.

The parties hereto stipulate and agree that the court may enter a final decree as prayed for in the substituted bill of complaint. A decree in accordance with the draft hereto attached will be satisfactory to the parties.

JAMES M. BECK,
Acting Attorney General.
JOHN H. DUNBAR,
Attorney General of the State of Washington.

AUGUST 20, 1924.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1924.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, plaintiff,
v.
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON. } No. 14—ORIGINAL.

DECREE.

On consideration of the substitute bill of complaint and the stipulation of the parties filed herein on the 22nd day of August, 1924, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the approval of the Secretary of the Interior of the several selections hereinafter described, filed by the State of Washington in part satisfaction of donations of land made to her by the United States on her admission to the Union, be and the same hereby are canceled and annulled as to the lands hereinbelow described, and the title to said land is adjudged and decreed to be in the United States for the use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as a part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim of the said State; all descriptions being referable to the Willamette Meridian:

(a) Selections filed in the local land office November 22, 1893, for the use and support of agricultural

colleges, designated as List No. 3, approved by the Secretary August 17, 1894. The Secretary's approval is canceled and annulled as to the following lands:

All of Section 2, E½ of Sec. 4, SE¼ of Sec. 24, all in T 7 N, R. 13 E; all of Section 24, SW¼ of Sec. 25, all of Sec. 26 and all of Sec. 34, all in T 8 N, R 13 E; W½ of Sec. 6, SE¼ of Sec. 6 and NW¼ of Sec. 8, all in T 7 N., R 14 E; and the title to said lands is adjudged and decreed to be in the United States for the use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as a part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim of said State.

(*b*) Selections filed in the local land office November 2, 1894, for State normal schools, designated as List No. 6, and approved by the Secretary April 21, 1896. The Secretary's approval is hereby canceled and annulled as to the following lands, to wit:

E½ of SW¼, SE¼ of NW¼ and Lot 3 of Sec. 4, N½ of NE¼ and N½ of NW¼ of Sec. 10, W½ of NW¼, W½ of SW¼ of Sec. 12, N½ of NE¼ and NE¼ of NW¼ of Sec. 14, E½ of NE¼ of Sec. 24, all in T 7 N, R 13 E; S½ of SE¼ and S½ of SW¼ of Sec. 14, SE¼ of SE¼ of Sec. 28, all in T 8 N, R 13 E; S½ of SW¼, W½ of SE¼, SE¼ of NW¼, SW¼ of NE¼, Lot 2, Lot 3 and SE¼ of SE¼ of Sec. 4, Lot 2, S½ of NE¼ of Sec. 6, N½ of NE¼, E½ of NW¼, Lot 1, Lot 4 and E½ of SW¼ of Sec. 18, all in T 7 N, R 14 E; and the title to said lands is adjudged and decreed to be in the United States for the use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as a part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim thereto by said State.

(*c*) Selections filed in the local land office November 22, 1893, for the use and support of agricultural colleges, designated as List No. 9, and approved by the Secretary May 9, 1898. The Secretary's approval is hereby canceled and annulled as to the following lands, to wit:

All of Section 35, T 8 N, R 13 E; Lot 4, SW¼ of NW¼ and W½ of SW¼ of Sec. 1, all of Sec. 3, N½ of NE¼ and NE¼ of NW¼ of Sec. 9, all in T 7 N, R 13 E; S½ of NW¼ of Sec. 25, W½ and SE¼ of Sec. 23, all in T 8 N, R 13 E; E½, E½ of NW¼ and E½ of SW¼ of Sec. 11, all in T 7 N, R 13 E; S½ of SE¼ and SE¼ of SW¼ of Sec. 27, E½, E½ of NW¼ and NE¼ of SW¼, and SE¼ of SW¼ of Sec. 33, all in T 8 N, R 13 E; NW¼ of NW¼ and E½ of Sec. 13, T 7 N, R 13 E; E½, E½ of NW¼ and E½ of SW¼ of Sec. 7, SW¼ of SW¼ of Sec. 5, Lots 1 and 2, and NE¼ of NW¼ of Sec. 19, all in T 7 N, R 14 E; and the title to said lands is adjudged and decreed to be in the United States for the use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as a part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim by said State.

(*d*) Selections filed in the local land office September 25, 1902, as indemnity school lands, designated as List No. 20, and approved by the Secretary July 19, 1907. The Secretary's approval is canceled and annulled as to the following lands, to wit:

Lots 4 and 5 and NW¼ of SW¼ of Sec. 2, T 7 N, R 12 E; and the title to said lands is adjudged and decreed to be vested in the United States for the

use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as a part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim by said State.

(e) Selections filed in the local land office September 27, 1893, for agricultural colleges, designated as List No. 11, and approved by the Secretary June 20, 1900. The Secretary's approval is canceled and annulled as to the following lands, to wit:

NW¼ of SE¼, SE¼ of SW¼, NW¼ of SW¼, NE¼ of SW¼, NW¼ of NE¼, NE¼ of NE¼, SE¼ of SE¼ of Sec. 8, all in T 7 N, R 14 E: and the title to said lands is adjudged and decreed to be in the United States for the use and occupancy of the Yakima Indians as part of their reservation, free and clear of any right or claim by said State.

Ex parte In the matter of Kingston Dry Dock and Construction Company, ——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
576. vs.
National Biscuit Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief of National Association of Retail Grocers et al. herein as amici curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. A. Cooke, Plaintiff in Error,
295. vs.
Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the consideration of the motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, postponed, the cause placed upon the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, December 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
391. vs.
Joseph Weisman et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 1st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, Appellant,
596. vs.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is

granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

DeWitt T. Law,
Plaintiff in Error,
550. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

October 13, 1924.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
669. vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Marx, Executor,
Plaintiff in Error,
523. vs.
Elizabeth Reinecke.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Union Trust Company of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
56. vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. L. Stickel,
Plaintiff in Error,
218. vs.
Big Laurel Coal Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Wulfsohn et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
65. vs.
Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Appellant,
21. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be,

and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Claude E. Barnes,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of New York.

36. In Error to the County Court of Jefferson County, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Jefferson County, New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Hines Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Amet Guillot, Sheriff and Ex-Officio Tax Collector of Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana.

57. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Ralph Tincher,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application to be presented to the Circuit Justice assigned to the Fourth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al., Appellants,
678. vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

On consideration of the motion that a limited number of printed copies of the record in this cause be accepted in lieu of the number required under the rule,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
435. vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
515. vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
516. vs.
Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver of Jones and Baker, Alleged Bankrupts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver Bower, Petitioner,
374. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alaska Electric Light and Power Company, Petitioner,
380. vs.
The City of Juneau et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Serena G. Levy, Petitioner,
390. vs.
S. H. Kress & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph Sabbatino et al.,
Petitioners,
399. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward S. Huff, Petitioner,
400. vs.
Henry Ford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas ex rel. J. S. Utley, Attorney General for the State of Arkansas for the use and benefit of Craighead County, Arkansas,
Plaintiff in Error,
410. vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elkton Electric Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
416. vs.
Thomas W. Perkins et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Rice Growers Association et al., Petitioners,
424. vs.
Lake Charles Rice Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. W. Swender, Petitioner,
428. vs.
Walter V. Empie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winthrop Smith, Petitioner,
431. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Leverkuhn, alias Jack Leverkuhn,

Petitioner,

434. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Grogan, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the First District of Michigan,

Petitioner,

437. vs.

Bryant Walker, Executor of the Last Will of Charles A. Kent, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baird Rubber & Trading Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

445. vs.

George D. Bates, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Portage Rubber Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Dolloff, Petitioner,
448. vs.
Steam Tug "Charlotte", Her Engines etc., Frank F. and Charles Fix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Tyman, Petitioner,
459. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oscar W. Uhrich et al., doing business under the name and style of Atchison Revolving Door Company,
Petitioners,
463. vs.
Van Kannel Revolving Door Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
464. vs.
William F. Regan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. B. Penton, Petitioner,
467. vs.
New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Des Moines Wholesale Grocer Company, Petitioner,
468. vs.
William C. Fraser, Trustee of the Nebraska-Iowa Mercantile Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kentucky Coke Company, Petitioner,
473. vs.
Keystone Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. H. Clements et al.,
Petitioners,
483. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfred H. Cowles, Petitioner,
492. vs.
Franz A. Rody.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Globe Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
493. vs.
Sulpho-Saline Bath Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Margaret G. Lawrence,
Petitioner,
499. vs.
Atlantic Paper & Pulp Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel C. Lawrence, Petitioner,
500. vs.
Atlantic Paper & Pulp Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. McCallum et al., constituting the Board of State Harbor Commissioners, etc.,
Petitioner,
503. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
504. vs.
The Plisson Steam Navigation Company, Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

505. vs.

Natale Suttore, Master of the Italian Steamship "Clara Camus", and as Agent etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Muller & Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

506. vs.

Erik Fingalsen, Master of the Norwegian Steamship "Ocvre", and as Agent etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Joe Shew, next friend of Lee Shear She,

Petitioner,

510. vs.

W. L. James, Master etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Broadway Rouss, Inc., Petitioner,
512. vs.
The Winchester Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Hamilton, Petitioner,
513. vs.
The Empire Gas & Fuel Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. A. Shriver et al., Petitioners,
514. vs.
The Empire Gas & Fuel Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Douglas A. Conklin, Petitioner,
517. vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mobile & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
519. vs.
C. M. Wood.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cora Schuler et al., Petitioners,
520. vs.
Wilhelmine Ohlendiek.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clifford C. Emmich, Petitioner,
521. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Express Company Aktieselskab,
Petitioner,
457. vs.
The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Hoxie".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for failure to file in time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ulster Steamship Company, Limited, et al.,
Petitioners,
649. vs.
Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston in behalf of Mr. George H. Terriberry for the petitioner.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
68. vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the Manufacturers Association of York, Pennsylvania; and the motion was denied.

Luisa Lim, Petitioner,
656. vs.
Tomas Cabigao.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Sheridan for the petitioner; with leave to counsel for the respondent to file a brief hereafter.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al., Appellants,
491. vs.
The Orinoco Iron Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Clyde H. Finley, Receiver, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
671. vs.
United Mine Workers of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. S. Drinker, Jr., in that behalf.

~~Clyde H. Finley, Receiver, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,~~
~~671. vs.~~

Atlantic Refining Company, Owner etc., Petitioner,
689. vs.
Merritt & Chapman Derrick and Wrecking Company.

Atlantic Refining Company, Owner etc., Petitioner,
690. vs.
Pilots' Association for Bay and River Delaware, Owner etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard M. Long, Mr. Harrington Putnam, and Mr. Francis S. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.

Fred F. Walz, Petitioner,
639. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul A. Neuffer for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. W. Dynes for the respondent.

Clarence H. Shively, Petitioner,
645. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner.

George H. Winn, Petitioner,
687. vs.
Ambrose E. Elliott et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted by Mr. I. N. Watson and Mr. Henry N. Ess for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred N. Gossett for the respondents.

Fidelity & Columbia Trust Company, Administrator etc., Plaintiff in Error,
119. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
447. vs.
Peter O'Shea.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman C. Gerdes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Abraham Lustgarten, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
70. vs.
Abraham Lustgarten.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lawrence J. Bershard for the respondent.

John F. Otis, Petitioner,
72. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the County Court of Oswego County, State of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for failure to prosecute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
63. vs.
John O'Hara.
Loomis for the petitioner.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John O. Yeyser and Mr. John C. Travis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Nelson H.

Endicott Johnson Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
64. vs.
William H. Smith.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Maurice E. Page for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Sam Silberschein,
Plaintiff in Error,
66. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Rowland W. Pixel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error.

The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
68. vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John V. Campbell, It is ordered that George D. Hile, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that J. L. London, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John V. Campbell, It is ordered that Carl F. Shuler, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Stuart, It is ordered that E. G. Wilson, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Stuart, It is ordered that James M. Springer, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, 3, Orig'l. vs. The State of Tennessee. — The motion for leave to L. M. Crawford to present oral argument herein by his counsel, as amicus curiae, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince in that behalf.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 80. vs. Edward H. Childs, Trustee etc. — This cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses Cohen for the respondent.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, 68. vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Company. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. Henry Wolf Bikle for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Aetna Life Insurance Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 62. vs. Mrs. Pearl Stone Dunken, Administratrix. — This cause was argued by Mr. W. J. Mooney for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted by Mr. C. A. Boynton, Mr. W. E. Spell, and Mr. J. A. Stanford for the defendant in error.

Southern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 71. vs. The City of Durham, North Carolina. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. M. Hendren for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. James S. Manning for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. F. M. Rivinus for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that James W. Woodford, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Conard E. Cooper, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Henry M. Gray, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that Mark T. Davis, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Lynch, It is ordered that W. E. Norvell, Jr., Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker, It is ordered that James Metzenbaum, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Appellant,
83. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, It is ordered that this cause be passed, and assigned for argument on Monday, November 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

John V. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error,
73. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. John V. Campbell, pro se, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

Max M. Horowitz, Appellant,
74. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, and by Mr. M. E. Otis for the appellee.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
75. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James J. Lynch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles C. Moore for the respondent.

Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, It is ordered that this cause be passed, and assigned for argument on Monday, November 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that Day.

Erie Coal & Coke Company,
Appellant,
78. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John S. Wise, Jr., for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conard B. Cooper, It is ordered that I. J. Ringolsky, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Terriberry, It is ordered that Edward M. Heath, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Rose, It is ordered that S. Lasker Ehrman, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chriss Landsberg, Petitioner,

87. vs.

The San Francisco & Portland Steamship Company.

On motion of Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in Error,
88. vs.
The People of the State of California.

On motion of Mr. Bernard W. McElroy in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Erie Coal & Coke Corporation,
Appellant,
78. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John S. Wise for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

J. W. Sunderland, Appellant,
79. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. G. Wilson for the appellant, continued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. J. M. Springer for the appellant.

B. Fernandez & Bros., Successors,
Petitioner,
82. vs.
Leonor Ayellon y Ojeda, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioners, continued by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioners; and submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Frank Antonsanti for the petitioner Julia Silva Hubadron.

George D. Hile, a Taxpayer,
Plaintiff in Error,
84. vs.
The City of Cleveland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George D. Hile, pro se. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. George, It is ordered that Alex. H. Quillan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Woodford, It is ordered that Robertson Honey, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Agent, Petitioner,
85. vs.
Mrs. Mary Kennedy, Administratrix.

This cause was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. E. Norvell, Jr., for the respondent.

Harry Glassman, Petitioner,
86. vs.
Robert C. Rand, Temporary Receiver etc.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
89. vs.
Wilson A. Taylor, Judge.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. U. Hayden for the plaintiff in error and petitioner, and by Mr. J. L. London for the defendant in error and respondent.

Southern Oil Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
90. vs.
Yale Natural Gas Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry M. Gray for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Rollin E. Gish for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Tampa-Inter-Ocean Steamship Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
91. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George H. Terriberry for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edward M. Heath for the defendant in error. The cause was continued, with leave to counsel for the defendant in error to present a motion to reargue principles of the case of No. 141, October Term, 1923, Texas Transport & Terminal Company, Inc., v. The City of New Orleans, decided February 18, 1924 (reported in 264 U. S., 150).

Mrs. M. L. House,
Plaintiff in Error,
92. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 2 of Conway County, Arkansas, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph M. Hill for the plaintiff in error, ~~and continued by Mr. Joseph M. Hill for the plaintiff in error,~~ and continued by Mr. George B. Rose for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Lasker Ehrman, It is ordered that June P. Wooten, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis A. Spiess, It is ordered that Omar T. McMahon, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Joseph Randolph Woodruff, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Samuel Lawrence Finn, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Godfrey L. Munter, It is ordered that Irving J. Solomon, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer J. Binford, It is ordered that M. Randolph Calhoun, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that Peter J. McLoughlin, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Frederick R. Gibbs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Frederick H. Lotterhos, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Edward J. Dempsey, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation, Appellant,	
31. vs.	
Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al.	Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the
Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al., Appellants,	Southern District of Ohio.
32. vs.	
Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cross-appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Sam Michaelson, Dan Cullen, Fred Henstra, et al., Petitioners,
246. vs.
The United States ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

S. C. Sandefur
232. vs.
Canoe Creek Coal Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York,

404, Oct. Term, 1922. Appellant, vs. Jules W. Arndstein.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

(On Rehearing).

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reaffirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

C. H. Love, W. L. Davis, J. B. Grigsby, et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

12. vs.

James S. Griffith, Alvin D. Moody, Robert Hing, et al.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Ivan Glavadanovic,

——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and

the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application in the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Frank W. Cardigan, Petitioner.

——, Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application in the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Stanley Copeland,

——, Original. Petitioner.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of error herein, referred by the Circuit Justice to this Court, be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Realty Holding Company,

Appellant,

348. vs.

Lavina B. Donaldson.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,

422. vs.

A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Edmund Ludwig Ring, deceased.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits; the cause placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, the Agent under the Section 206, Transportation Act, 1920,

Plaintiff in Error,

557. vs.

Hettie McCree.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde H. Finley, Receiver, et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

671. vs.

United Mine Workers of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

3, Orig'l. vs.

The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of L. M. Crawford to present oral argument herein by his counsel, as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Alexander Milburn Company,

Petitioner,

472. vs.

Davis-Bournonville Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
537. vs.
Fort Morgan Steamship Company, Limited, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, therecord already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
541. vs.
Galbreath Cattle Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ. Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
591. vs.
The Trenton Potteries Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Union Trust Company,
Petitioner,
466. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 3, of Van Buren County, Arkansas,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Postum Cereal Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
497. vs.
California Fig Nut Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Save Electric Corporation,
Petitioner,
508. vs.
General Electric Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Parfume De Grande Luxe, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
530. vs.
Coty, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmina L. Burget,
Petitioner,
531. vs.
C. M. Cranston et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mercantile Bank of the Americas, Inc.,
Petitioner,
532. vs.
Steamship "General G. W. Goethals", Her Engines etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Gunther, as Trustee of the Estate of Marion A. Bullyon, a Bankrupt, Petitioner.

535. vs.

The Home Insurance Company of New York et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General American Tank Car Corporation, Petitioner,

555. vs.

B. K. Goree, Receiver of Home Oil Refining Company of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, the Agent under Section 206, Transportation Act, 1920, Plaintiff in Error,

557. vs.

Hettie McCree.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Petitioner,
558. vs.
American Fruit Growers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert F. Raine, Petitioner,
559. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ellsworth Mason, Petitioner,
670. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfred Street, Suing on Behalf of Himself and All Other Seamen, etc., Petitioner,
560. vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nypania Transportation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
561. vs.
Steam Lighter "Sagamore", Her Engines, etc., New York & New Jersey Steamboat Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Canton Company of Baltimore et al., Petitioners,
567. vs.
Andrew B. Brown, as Master of the Steamship "Santa Barbara".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental National Bank, Petitioner,
568. vs.
William H. Moore, Jr., as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Julius A. Magassin, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Continental National Bank,

Petitioner,

568. vs.

William H. Moore, Jr., as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Julius K. Magassin, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,

569. vs.

Paul L. Tustison.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel O. Lazarus et al., Copartners doing Business under the Firm Nameand Style of Lewis Lazarus & Son, Petitioners,

570. vs.

New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter P. McDonough et al.,
Petitioners,
572. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Hurwitz, Petitioner,
574. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
576. vs.
National Biscuit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
586. vs.
Harry L. Kast.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
587. vs.
John J. Flechtner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
588. vs.
Evron Robertson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rolph Navigation & Coal Company, Owner and Claimant of the Barkentine "Rolph", etc., Petitioner,
592. vs.
Demetrius Kohilas et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mercantile Trust Company,
Petitioner,
595. vs.
John F. Schlafly, Trustee of Temtor Corn and Fruit Products Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Denaro, Petitioner,
601. vs.
American Cone & Wafer Company, Incorporated, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
602. vs.
Supreme Manufacturing Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
603. vs.
Emanuel Gross.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Reading Company, Petitioner,
604. vs.
Marius Nielsen & Son, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
605. vs.
Marius Nielsen & Son, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads of the United States, Petitioner,
610. vs.
Arthur Gifford et al., Copartners doing Business under the Firm Name and Style of Gifford Brothers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. W. Pickford et al., as the Creditors' Committee of Empire Tire & Rubber Corporation,

Petitioner,

611. vs.

Arthur H. Kood, as Sole Acting Receiver of Empire Tire & Rubber Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Boylston National Bank of Boston, Petitioner,

612. vs.

David W. Wainhouse, New England Newspaper Publishing Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nickolaos D. Zahadeires,

Petitioner,

615. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred E. Earles et al.,
Petitioners,
616. vs.
A. W. Drake Manufacturing Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is now here ordered by this Court that, for the convenience of counsel and litigants, the cases coming to this Court from the Ninth Circuit, from No. 126 to 371, inclusive, be, and they are hereby, assigned for hearing beginning Monday, February 23d next, in advance of other cases on the regular docket.

It is further ordered that the Clerk notify counsel in the above specified cases of this order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from Monday, the 27th instant, to Monday, November 17th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, deceased, Petitioner,
273. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy and Sylvester J. Pierce, Appellants,
509. vs.
William F. Waldow, as Sheriff of Erie County, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Benjamin W. Morse, Appellant,
597. vs.
The United States of America.
Harry F. Morse, Appellant,
598. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to consolidate and advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Direction der Disconto-Gesellschaft,
Appellant,
676. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, Egremont John Mills, et al., etc.

Bank fur Handel and Industrie,
Appellant,
677. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, English Association of American Bond & Shareholders, Limited, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred K. Nippert for the appellants, with the concurrence of Mr. Frederick H. Coudert in behalf of the British Government.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company,
Trustee, Petitioner,
389. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 7, of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. B. Rose for the petitioner.

North Carolina Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
322. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff of Alamance County, North Carolina, et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chapin Brown in behalf of Mr. W. P. Bynum and Mr. H. C. Strudwick for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. W. M. Hendren, and Mr. L. M. Jeffries for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
127. vs.
The United States of America.

Mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner.

A. Brambini et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
238. vs.
The United States.

A. Brambini et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
259. vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Humboldt, Hon. Denver Sevier, Judge.

The motion to consolidate, to be heard as one case, one record only to be printed, was granted, on motion of Mr. Robert Ash for the plaintiffs in error.

Michael Hilsinger et al.,
Petitioners,
692 & 693. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. Dempsey and Mr. Michael G. Heintz for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondents.

Alexander E. Block et al.,
Petitioners,
658. vs.
The Jung Arch Brace Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Love Hopkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter F. Murray for the respondent.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of The Louis J. Bergdoll Motor Company,
Petitioner,
668. vs.
~~The~~ Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Catharine for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter B. Gibbons and Mr. Harry C. Kohlhas, Jr., for the respondent.

Rotterdamsche Lloyd Stoomvaart Maatschappij, Java-China-Japan, Lijn, et al.,
Petitioners,
682. vs.
Gosho Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. J. McCutchen and Mr. Allan P. Matthew for the respondent.

Albert E. Queck, Executor of Harry P. Queck, deceased,

684. vs.

Elmer C. Hanker, Group Head of the Pittsburgh Federal Prohibition Office.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Sheppard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The South Carolina Gas & Electric Company et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

347. vs.

The City of Spartanburg et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. M. L. House,

Plaintiff in Error,

92. vs.

Road Improvement District No. 2, of Conway County, Arkansas, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George B. Rose for the defendants in error, by Mr. Lasker Ehrman for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph M. Hill for the plaintiff in error.

Mrs. M. L. House,

Plaintiff in Error,

93. vs.

Road Improvement District No. 5, of Conway County, Arkansas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph M. Hill for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George B. Rose for the defendants in error.

The State of Louisiana on the relation of The Consumers Biscuit Company, Plaintiff in Error,

94. vs.

Andrew J. McShane, Mayor of the City of New Orleans, and the Commission Council of the City of New Orleans.

This cause was submitted by Mr. E. J. Bowers for the plaintiff in error; with leave to counsel for the defendant in error to file a brief herein within fifteen days, on motion of Mr. Oscar

W. Underwood, Jr., in that behalf.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,

95. vs.

Szejua Waldman and her Minor Children, Zenia, Bessie, and Sophia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Max J. Kohler for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percival H. Marshall, It is ordered that Don R. Almy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Alpha Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
103 & 327. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Basil Robillard in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of American Sales Book Company et al. herein, as amici curiae.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, et al., Appellants,
665. vs.
Ambler Realty Company.

Leave was granted Mr. A. Warner Parker to withdraw his appearance as counsel for the appellants in this cause.

Anna Woerishoffer et al., Executrix etc., Appellants,
107. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. F. L. Fishback in that behalf.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,
95. vs.
Szejua Waldman and her minor children et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Max J. Kohler for the respondents.

W. I. Biddle, Warden etc.,
96. vs.
Isadore Luvisch.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for W. I. Biddle, Warden etc., and by Mr. I. J. Ringolsky for Isadore Luvisch. Leave was granted Mr. I. J. Ringolsky to file an additional brief herein within one week.

The United States, Appellant,
98. vs.
Charles A. Morrow.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
99. vs.
Jefferson F. Moses.

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. King for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Merrill E. Otis, and Mr. John G. Ewing for the appellant.

The A. B. Small Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
100. vs.
Lamborn Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Petters, It is ordered that Edwin B. Morgan, Esquire, of Galena, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Loftus, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

109.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs to be paid by the defendants in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company, Petitioner,
606.& vs.
607.
Hugh D. MacKenzie Company, Limited, etc.

The motion of Mr. J. H. Billery to extend the time within which to file a brief for the respondent herein was denied.

Lydia Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Lydia", Her Engines etc., et al., Petitioners,
608 & vs.
609.
Hugh D. MacKenzie Company, Limited etc.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnson.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

John L. Anderson, Plaintiff in Error,
114. vs.
The City of Macon et al.

This cause was passed, per stipulation, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

The A. B. Small Company, Plaintiff in Error,
100. vs.
Lamborn & Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error.

The A. B. Small Company, Plaintiff in Error,
101. vs.
American Sugar Refining Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Orville A. Park for the defendant in error.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
102. vs.
The Formica Insulation Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John C. Kerr for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner, by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent, and by Mr. John H. Lee for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that J. W. Hunt, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that Elmer Vernon Roth, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that Lewis Landes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that George W. Bassett, Jr., Esquire, of St. Augustine, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, It is ordered that Dennis H. Dwyer, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan; and William Wagar Macpherson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Frank S. Bright in behalf of Harvey D. Goulder for the Lake Carriers Association, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
116. vs.
Rena Napoleon and Rosa Napoleon, plaintiff in Error.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the

Ernest Bell, Plaintiff in Error,
118. vs.
The State of Texas.

In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
120. vs.
T. H. Dunn et al.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner.
108. vs.
The Formica Insulation Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. John H. Lee for the respondent.

Alpha Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
103 & 327. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This cause was argued by Mr. Louis H. Porter for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the defendant in error.

A. W. Duckett & Company, Inc., Appellant,
108. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Don R. Almy for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, It is ordered that R. Chandler Davis, Esquire, of Gloucester, State of Massachusetts; Louis H. Solomon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Carlton W. Wonson, Esquire, of Gloucester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
129. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

John O. Yeiser,
Plaintiff in Error,
130. vs.
T. B. Dysart et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John O. Yeiser for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

The St. John's Electric Company,
Appellant,
131. vs.
The City of St. Augustine, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. George W. Bassett in that behalf, this cause was passed, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

The St. Johns Electric Company,
Appellant,
167. vs.
The City of St. Augustine, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. George W. Bassett in that behalf, this cause was passed, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, ~~on motion of Mr. George W. Bassett in that behalf.~~

A. W. Duckett & Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
108. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

John G. Morrison, Jr., et al.,
Appellants,
112. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the appellants, and by Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the appellees.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
113. vs.
Freda Groeger, Administratrix etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. T. Kinder for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. C. Chapman for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Weldell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles W. Gerstenberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmond D. Adcock, It is ordered that George F. Barrett, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that J. P. Lorentzen, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leon Hornstein, It is ordered that Leo V. Cleary, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that Henry A. Behrendt, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Richard P. Ettinger, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Plaintiff in Error,
44. vs.
George D. Henderson.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Plaintiff in Error,
44. vs.
George D. Henderson.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Plaintiff in Error,
44. vs.
George D. Henderson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and

the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land and Water Company, Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Trustee etc., et al.,

Appellants,

8. vs.

A. E. Caldwell, W. F. Mikesell, V. E. Morgan, et al., etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix etc.,

Petitioner,

273. vs.

Alworth-Stephens Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al.,

Appellants,

509. vs.

William F. Waldow, Sheriff etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
389. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Direction der Disconto Gesellschaft,
Appellant,
676. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, et al.

Bank fur Handel and Industrie,
Appellant,
677. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin W. Morse, Appellant,
597. vs.
The United States.

Harry F. Morse, Appellant,
598. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Hile, a Taxpayer,
Plaintiff in Error,
84. vs.
The City of Cleveland.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Southern Oil Corporation,

Plaintiff in Error,

90. vs.

Yale Natural Gas Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines etc.,

Petitioner,

631. vs.

Citro Chemical Company of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines etc.,

Petitioner,

632. vs.

Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Convoy Steamship Company, Limited, Owner etc., Petitioner,
633. vs.
Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Harrison, Trustee of the Western Hope Manufacturing Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
635. vs.
Anna B. Chamberlain.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
642. vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker D. Hines, Late Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
643. vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delia Salzer,
Plaintiff in Error,
564. vs.
The United States of America et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
606. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
607. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lydia Steamship Company, Claimant of Steamship "Lydia", etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
608. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lydia Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Lydia", etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
609. vs.
Hugh D. Mackenzie Company, Limited, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Kepl, Petitioner,
617. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Petitioner,
621. vs.
Northern Industrial Chemical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Duplex Derouen, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
625. vs.
Southwest Louisiana Farm Mortgage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Franklin Purnell et al., Petitioners,
626. vs.
John W. Hansel et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth-Atlantic National Bank of Boston,
627. Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Probate Court of Middlesex County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Probate Court of Middlesex County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The First National Bank of Boston,
659. Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Probate Court of Essex County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Probate Court of Essex County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Petitioner,
628. vs.
Bank of Waterproof.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eva M. Sowers, Petitioner, vs. L. E. Kenworthy et al. 630. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Western Power Company of California, Petitioner, vs. Milton Bernard, Trustee of Pacific Alloy and Steel Company, Bankrupt. 634. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard H. Field, Petitioner, vs. The Kansas City Refining Company et al. 637. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred P. Walz, Petitioner, vs. Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company. 639. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. L. Coleman, Petitioner,
640. vs.
W. T. Apple.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel N. McClean et al.,
Petitioners,
641. vs.
M. A. Bradley et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Petrona Lim et al., Petitioners,
644. vs.
Tomas Cabigao.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence H. Shively, Petitioner,
645. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cities Fuel & Power Company,
Petitioner,
646. vs.
Joseph Button et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ulster Steamship Company, Limited,
Claimant etc., Petitioner,
649. vs.
Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest A. Brady et al.,
Petitioners,
657. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander E. Block et al.,
Petitioners,
658. vs.
The Jung Arch Brace Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Hendriks, Petitioner,
664. vs.
Atlas Land Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
666. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

October 27, 1924.

Rotterdamsche Lloyd et al.,
Petitioners,
682. vs.
Gosho Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Chief Justice Taft.

Albert H. Queck, Executor etc.,
Petitioner,
684. vs.
Elmer C. Hawker, Group Head of the Pittsburgh Federal Prohibition Office.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Winn, Petitioner,
687. vs.
Ambrose E. Elliott et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Refining Company, Owner of the Steamer "Herbert L. Pratt",
Petitioner,
689. vs.
Merritt & Chapman Derrick and Wrecking Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Refining Company, Owner of the Steamer "Herbert L. Pratt",
Petitioner,
690. vs.
Pilots' Association for Bay and River Delaware, Owner of the "Philadelphia".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Hilsinger et al.,
Petitioners,
692. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Hilsinger et al.,
Petitioners,
693. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion that certain lands be released from the Receivership was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

The United States, Appellant,
527. vs.
Harriet Rogers Flannery et al., Executors etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Leon Hornstein for The City of Chicago, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that all briefs herein as amici curiae be filed and served on or before November 10th next, on motion of Mr. Edmond D. Adcock for the appellant.

Barclay & Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
547. vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector etc.

The motion to advance and consolidate this cause with No. 320, heretofore assigned for November 17th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. McCumber in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
444. vs.
The Archibald McNeil & Sons Company, Inc.

The motion to advance this cause and place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Burr for the defendant in error.

The Pennsylvania System Board of Adjustment of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, and Station Employees, Appellants,
629. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry T. Hunt for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. John Hampton Barnes for the appellee in opposition thereto.

C. Henry Peery, Petitioner,
691. vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Ellis in behalf of Mr. William H. Werth for the petitioner.

Alpha Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
103 & 327. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the defendant in error, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief herein.

Philip Miller, Petitioner,
674. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick R. Austin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Philip Miller, Petitioner,
675. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick R. Austin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Louis B. Page, Petitioner,
695. vs.
Mark A. Skinner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth

Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Harrison and Mr. Harvey Riddell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willcbrandt, and Mr. Sewell Key for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 17th next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Benjamin Poss, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Charles H. Kaplan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that Athanasius A. Pantelis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett, It is ordered that J. Henry Caruthers, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that Walter S. Dillon, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Joseph Henry Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merton L. Corey, It is ordered that Edward F. Dougherty, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Philip S. Dickinson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant I. Rosenzweig, It is ordered that Charles Edward McCoy, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Niven, It is ordered that Leo A. Mullaney, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Nelson Trottman, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Percy J. Donovan, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton, Limited,

Plaintiff in Error,

10. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

State Tax Commission.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr.Justice McReynolds.

Gorham Manufacturing Company,

Appellant,

5. vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

State Tax Commission of the State of New York et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Endicott Johnson Corporation,

Plaintiff in Error,

41. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Encyclopedia Press, Inc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Endicott Johnson Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
64. vs.
William H. Smith.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Sovereign Camp, Woodmen of the World, Appellant,
58. vs.
E. E. O'Neill, B. F. Vaughan, R. H. Buck, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America, Appellants,
35. vs.
Frederick Y. Robertson.
Frederick Y. Robertson, Appellant,
145. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Ferries Company, Appellant,
46. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error. In Error to the United States Circuit
4. vs. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
James Rook.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Savage Arms Corporation,
Appellant,
13. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Sam Silbersohein,
Plaintiff in Error,
66. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

J. W. Sunderland, Appellant,
79. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States, Appellant,

99. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Jefferson F. Moser.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,

Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court

67. vs. of the State of Arkansas.

Western Crawford Road Improvement District.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmedwith costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appeal from the District Court of

68. Appellants, the United States for the Middle

vs. District of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
89. vs.
Wilson A. Taylor, Judge of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
89. vs.
Wilson A. Taylor, Judge of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Petitioner,
89. vs.
Wilson A. Taylor, Judge of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Frank Gonsalves, Appellant,
3. vs.
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause

be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas,

96. vs.

Isadore Luvisch.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that this certificate must be dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mrs. M. L. House,

Plaintiff in Error,

92. vs.

Road Improvement District No. 2, of Conway County, Arkansas, and R. E. Bartlett, Sheriff of Conway County, Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mrs. M. L. House,

Plaintiff in Error,

93. vs.

Road Improvement District No. 5, of Conway County, Arkansas, and R. E. Bartlett, Sheriff of Conway County, Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is here-

by, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
71. vs.
The City of Durham, North Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Fred N. Crouch, Legal Guardian of Kathleen Konstovich, Widow,
Plaintiff in Error,
61. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit under the Act of Congress approved September 14, 1922.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, with directions to proceed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Agent appointed by the President under the Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,
60. vs.
J. M. Currie.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. R. L. Hanna. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas. — 54.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Martin Kirkendall. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial District of the State of Ohio. — 51.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial District of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Appellant, vs. Max Smith and Margaret Smith. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. — 7.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,

17. vs.

The United States of America ex rel. W. G. Lynn, Guardian of Rosa Lasley, an Incompetent Osage Indian Allottee.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edward P. Avent, Jr., Plaintiff in Error,

52. vs.

The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Louis B. Mackenzie, Petitioner,

55. vs.

A. Engelhard & Sons Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

A. Engelhard & Sons Company,
Petitioner,
59. vs.
Louis B. Mackenzie.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Sanford.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

B. Fernandez & Bros., Successors,
Petitioners,
82. vs.
Leonor Ayllon y Ojeda, in her own right and as Guardian ad litem of her minor brother and sister, Jose and Carmen Ayllon y Ojeda.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James C. Davis, Agent, Petitioner,

85. vs. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

Mrs. Mary Kennedy, Administratrix of the Estate of Dave Kennedy, deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. W. Duckett & Company, Inc.,

Appellant,

108. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to award proper compensation to the appellant.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chicago Great Western Railway Company,

Appellant,

22. vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa, Walter C. Ramsay, Secretary of State of Iowa; Glenn C. Haynes, Auditor of the State of Iowa, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,

Appellant,

23. vs.

Nathan E. Kendall, Governor of the State of Iowa; Walter C. Ramsay, Secretary of State of Iowa; Glenn C. Haynes, Auditor of the State of Iowa, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nassau Smelting and Refining Works, Ltd., Plaintiff in Error,

37. vs.

The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Shewan & Sons, Inc., Appellant,

42. vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and

the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration,

Petitioner,

95. vs.

Szejwa Waldman and her three minor children, Zenia, Bessie, and Sophia.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of The United States, and Frank White, Treasurer of The United States,

Appellants,

491. vs.

The Orinoco Iron Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1924.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

On the motion of The United States, intervener, the order herein of June 11, 1923, relating to certain Indian lands, is hereby revoked, and the lands described in that order are hereby released unconditionally from the Receivership.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Appellant,
29. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to set this cause for oral argument,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument with No. 83 heretofore assigned for Monday, November 17th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
391. vs.
Joseph Weissman et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits; and the cause placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Louisiana on the relation of the Consumers Biscuit Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
94. vs.
Andrew J. McShane, Mayor of the City of New Orleans, and The Commission Council of the City of New Orleans.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barclay & Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
547. vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and consolidate with cause No. 320,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument with No. 320 heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, November 17th, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
527. vs.
Harriet Rogers Flannery et al., Executors etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
444. vs.
The Archibald McNeil & Sons Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and place the same on the summary docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Boyd, Petitioner,
——— vs.
D. M. Hutton.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion and petition be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank J. Harrigan, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
668. vs.
Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sovereign Camp of the Woodmen of the World, Petitioner,
623. vs.
Alice C. Shelton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the County Court of Frio County, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of Frio County, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,
388. vs.
The City of Cleburne et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. S. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc.,

451 to 456. Appellants, vs.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company and others.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,

579. vs.

Henrietta Martin, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marine Smokeless Coal Company, Petitioner,

582. vs.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of McDowell County, State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of McDowell County, State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Velma Pinnell, Petitioner,

585. vs.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. R. Freeman et al., Receivers etc., Petitioners, vs. George Grove. 620. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Maryland Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. M. M. Brown et al., Partners etc. 647. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Randolph County, State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Randolph County, State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Maryland Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. M. M. Brown et al., Partners etc. 648. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philip Miller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 674 & 675. On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. Henry Peery, Petitioner,
691. vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louise B. Page, Petitioner,
695. vs.
Mark A. Skinner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest E. Marks Company et al.,
Petitioners,
618. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to file within the statutory time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Paper & Type Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
237. vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
341. vs.
Lucia Maponiello et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of Mr. Charles N. Goodnow for the defendants in error in support of the motion; and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Ray Consolidated Copper Company,
Appellant,
443. vs.
The United States.

Motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The United States et al.,
Petitioners,
515. vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee etc.

The United States of America et al.,
Petitioners,
516. vs.
Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
336. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. William L. Frierson in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al., Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury in that behalf.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,
345. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works

On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Mr. John E. Benton herein on behalf of Twenty States as amici curiae.

R. H. Clemmer, Attorney in Fact etc., et al., Petitioners,
382. vs.
Arthur L. Ross and The General Stores Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. H. H. Rumble, of counsel for the petitioners, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay his or their own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Worthington, Petitioner,
685. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker in behalf of Mr. Samuel Block for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

William R. Warner Company, Petitioner,
32, Oct. Term, 1923. vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

The motion to retax costs herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W. Bradford in that behalf, and by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. George W. Wickersham, Mr. Roger S.

Baldwin, and Mr. Joseph W. Henderson in opposition thereto.

Ella A. Dahlgren et al., etc., Petitioners,
707. vs.
Winthrop Dahlgren.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wharton E. Lester for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, Mr. George T. Hoover, and Mr. Frederic C. Scofield for the respondent.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc., Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Milburn for the appellant.

Robert S. Lee et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
581. vs.
The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State.

The motion to extend the time within which to deposit the estimated costs in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard A. Ford in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Ex parte In the matter of E. L. Smart,
---.
Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company, Appellant,
624. vs.
W. H. Adamson et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. George Donworth and Mr. Elmer E. Todd for the appellant, and by Mr. Carroll B. Graves for the appellee, with leave to the appellant to file a reply brief hereafter.

The United States of America ex rel. Pauline Fink, Petitioner,
698. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. Max J. Kohler for the petitioner, with leave to present a letter of the Solicitor General of the United States concurring in the petition for writ of certiorari in this case.

Elkton Electric Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
416. vs.
Thomas W. Perkins et al., Receivers.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. P. Keech, Jr., in support of the motion.

William Leather et al., Appellants,
313. vs.
Mark J. White.

The motion to advance this cause and for a decree pro confesso was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger in opposition thereto.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al., Appellants,
491. vs.
The Orinoco Iron Company.

On motion of Mr. William R. Harr for the appellee, the mandate in this cause was granted.

August Tammio, Petitioner,
702. vs.
The Panama Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Challen B. Ellis in behalf of Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the respondent.

Columbia Ribbon Company, Petitioner,
683. vs.
Marshall's, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellridge R. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur S. Phillips for the respondent.

E. B. Engel, Petitioner,
697. vs.
J. O. Davenport et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to

the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner.

Park Falls Lumber Company, Petitioner,
699. vs.
Everett H. Burlingame, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Bennet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Joe Williams et al., Petitioners,
700. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. June P. Wooten for the petitioner.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners,
704. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Francis Kelly for the petitioners.

James H. DeVeuve et al., Petitioners,
708. vs.
Black Hook Power & Irrigation Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cornelius H. Hanford for the petitioners.

South Fork Brewing Company et al., Petitioners,
711. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Burdeau for the petitioners.

South Fork Brewing Company, et al., Petitioners,
711. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Burdeau for the petitioners.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was reassigned for Monday, December 1st next, at the foot of the call for that day, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, intervener.

The argument on the supplemental motion of the defendant, The State of Texas, asking leave to file request of that State directing Receiver to pay the gross production tax due the State of Texas, etc., commenced by Mr. Mr. Thomas Watt Gregory for the State of Texas, continued by Mr. John Spalding Flannery for Frederic A. Delano, Receiver, and concluded by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the State of Texas.

College Point Boat Corporation, Appellant,
121. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Julian C. Hammack for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that Ray C. Johnson, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that Paul E. Shorb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; J. Gilbert Hardgrove, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; Newell W. Ellison, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Dean G. Acheson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Prewitt Semmes, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that John B. Johnson, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State

of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Niven, It is ordered that William B. Collins, Esquire, of Sheboygan, State of Wisconsin; William L. Tibbs, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse B. Roote, It is ordered that Melville E. Peters, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist, It is ordered that Frank A. Boys, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that Newell W. Ellison, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David L. Podell, It is ordered that Benjamin S. Hirsh, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Samuel H. Hofstadter, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that Ralph G. Lockwood, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, It is ordered that Thomas H. Robinson, Esquire, of Bel Air,

State of Maryland; and Edward H. Burke, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet, It is ordered that Raymond L. Dillman, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced an order as to the Clerk's bond, as follows:

ORDER. A renewal bond, executed by the Clerk pursuant to the order of the Court entered October 5, 1921, was filed in the words and figures, following, viz:

S. B. 167375.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That we, William R. Stansbury, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, as principal, and The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, as surety, are held and firmly bound, for the period of three years beginning with the execution hereof, under the United States of America, for the benefit of the litigants in the Supreme Court of the United States and of all others, as their interests may appear, in the penal sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States for the benefit of the said litigants and of all others, as their interests may appear, for which payments, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals, and dated this 6th day of October, 1924.

NOW, THEREFORE, The condition of this bond is such that if the said William R. Stansbury, Clerk as aforesaid, shall well and truly perform the services for which moneys by law or under the rules of the Court are advanced or paid to him, and shall truly and faithfully account for such moneys thus advanced or paid, and for any excess thereof after the services are rendered, and also for all other moneys received by him as such Clerk, in accordance with law or the orders of this Court, then this obligation to be void; otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

WITNESSES:
(Signed) HORATIO STONER.
(Signed) E. M. FINNEGAN.
(Signed) F. D. COMPTON.

(Signed) WM. R. STANSBURY, Principal.
THE AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY,
By:(Signed)J.T.JONES,Attorney in Fact.(SEAL).

(Signed) _____.

Approved November 5th, 1924, by order of the Court.

(Signed) WM. H. TAFT.

Chief Justice of the
United States.

ORDERED that the bond for $100,000, additional to his official bond, required of the Clerk by order of the Court dated October 4th, 1921, and duly executed by him, and the Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, on October 6th, 1924, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be deposited with the Attorney General for safe keeping.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

It is ordered by this Court that the motion of The State of Texas for leave to file a petition for an order requiring the Receiver to pay gross production and pipe-line taxes be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the petition ordered filed.

It is further ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, as respects gross production tax, with certain qualifications, and denied as respects the pipe-line tax.

Decision announced by Mr.Justice Van Devanter.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General etc., et al., Appellants,
195. vs.
A. Sardell.

On motion of Mr. Leon Lamfrom for Folding Furniture Works, Inc., leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Ex parte In the matter of Philip
24, Grossman, Orig'l. Petitioner.

On motion of Mr. Francis M. Curlee and Mr. Charles M. Hay in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

College Point Boat Corporation,
121. Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Swiss National Insurance Company, Limited, Appellant,
132. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hoke Smith for the appellant, and by Mr.

Merrill E. Otis for the appellees.

The United States of America ex rel. Dominick Didato,

Appellant,

133. vs.

William C. Hecht, United States Marshal.

The United States of America ex rel. Abe Silverschein, Appellants,

134. vs.

William C. Hecht, United States Marshal.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellee; and case submitted by Mr. M. Michael Edelstein for the appellants.

Southern Pacific Company,

117. vs.

The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Walker. It is ordered that Margaret F. Lutz, of Washington, District of Columbia; Eunice K. Warner, of Washington, District of Columbia; Adele Virginia Smith, of Washington, District of Columbia; and James J. Sweeney, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Gray, It is ordered that William S. Butler, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David L. Podell, It is ordered that Robert Moers, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James H. DeVeuve et al.,
Petitioners,
708. vs.
Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Dale S. Drain in that behalf, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause as to petitioners Manly B. Haynes and Elaine H. Haynes,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, as to petitioners Manly B. Haynes and ElaineH. Haynes.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank L. Wagner
280. vs.
Nicholas Apfelbaum, Administratrix etc.

On motion of Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
117. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant.

The Delaware and Hudson Company et al.,
Appellants,
212. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
236. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Frierson for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
285. vs.
The United States.
Western Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
287. vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant in No. 285.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Elam L. Clarke, Esquire, of Waukegon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Taylor, It is ordered that Oliver Dean, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that John Godfrey Saxe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David L. Podell, It is ordered that Susan Brandeis, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar L. Greever, It is ordered that Landon C. Bell, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Herman Waldman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leon B. Lamfrom, It is ordered that John H. Paul, Esquire, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
285. vs.
The United States.
The Western Pacific Railroad, Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant in No. 285, and by Mr. George F. Williams for the appellant in No. 287, and concluded by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellees.

Luckenbach Steamship Company and The United States of America
258. vs.
Norwegian Barque "Thekla", Her Tackle, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for Luckenbach Steamship Company and The United States of America, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight for the Norwegian Barque "Thekla", Her Tackle, etc.

The Charles Wolff Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
207 and 208. vs.
The Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. R. Hite for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. J. G. Egan for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendant in error.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
104. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,
105. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

Harry Satz, Appellant,
106. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. David L. Podell for the appellants.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Walter Chalaire, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. V. Lindabury, It is ordered that Frederic J. Faulks, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, It is ordered that Paul W. Crawford, Esquire, of Leadville, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. V. Lindabury, It is ordered that John William Bishop, Jr., Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer J. Binford, It is ordered that Lex Kintner, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Sullivan, It is ordered that Philip Herman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

John H. Ford
277. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator of the Estate of Victor M. Sturgis, deceased.

Union Iron Works Company,
278. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

Reginald W. Geare
279. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

Frank L. Wagner
280. vs.
Nicholas Appelbaum, Administrator etc.

Leave was granted to Mr. J. C. Gibson to appear and make oral argument herein for John H. Ford, Union Iron Works, and Reginald W. Geare, pro hac vice, on motion of Mr. J. C. Sullivan in that behalf.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
104. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,
105. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

Harry Satz, Appellant,
106. vs.
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. David L. Podell for the appellants, and by Mr. S. H. Hofstadter for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. F. C. Benvenga for the appellees.

John H. Ford
277. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator of the Estate of Victor M. Sturgis, deceased.
Union Iron Works
278. vs.
Guy Sturgis, as Administrator etc.
Reginald W. Geare
279. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.
Frank L. Wagner
280. vs.
Nicholas Appelbaum, Administrator etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright for Reginald W. Geare. The Court declined to hear further argument.

John H. Ford,
277. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator of the Estate of Victor M. Sturgis, Deceased.

Union Iron Works
278. vs.
Guy Sturgis, as Administrator etc.

Reginald W. Geare
279. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

Frank L. Wagner
280. vs.
Nicholas Apfelbaum, Administrator etc.

On a Certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that this certificate must be dismissed for the reason that the form of certificate by the Court of Appeals of questions to be answered is not within the requirement of Section 239 of the Judicial Code.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Wagner,
Plaintiff in Error,
162. vs.
The City of Milwaukee et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Leon B. Lamfrom for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Benjamin Poss for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Michigan Public Utilities Commission et al.,
Appellants,
283. vs.
Coral W. Duke, doing business as Duke Cartage Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. E. Spalding for the appellants, and submitted by Mr. Hal H. Smith and Mr. Percy J. Donovan for the appellee.

The City of Newark et al.,
Appellants,
351. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury for the appellee Central Railroad Company of New Jersey

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lester Wood, It is ordered that Paul E. Hadlick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Briggs G. Simpich, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Willis D. Mance, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Donald D. Shepard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Ward Loveless, of Birmingham, State of Alabama; ~~Wallace Hervey Jackson, Esquire,~~ Rowena U. Compton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Albert T. Clark, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan; I. R. Blaisdell, Esquire, of Deer Lodge, State of Montana; George G. Witter, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana; and Charles P. Taft, 2d, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that Wallace Hervey Jackson, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that V. G. Holland, Esquire, of Blytheville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Joseph L. Verrillo, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that Frank A. Huffer, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Louis H. Burns, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Edward G. Inco, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that Arthur Sullivan, Esquire, of Hardy, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

~~On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo V. Morgan, It is ordered that George W. P. Whip, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland.~~

Herman G. Gerdes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Abraham Lustgarten, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
70. vs.
Abraham Lustgarten.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

James C. Davis, Agent of the President under Section 206 of the Transportation Act, 1920, Petitioner,
63. vs.
John O'Hara.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Samuel D. White, as Trustee of the Estate of Pete Stump, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
20. vs.
Veta Stump.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

80. vs.

Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. Menist Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

William R. Warner & Company,

Petitioner,

32, Oct.Term, 1923. vs.

Eli Lilly & Company.

On consideration of the motion to retax the costs in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert S. Lee et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

561. vs.

The People of the State of Illinois ex rel.Louis L.Emmerson, Secretary of State.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time within which to deposit the estimated costs in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of E. L. Smart, (—, Orig. 1) Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray Consolidated Copper Company, Appellant,
443. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney, Appellant,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc., Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
515. vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee etc.
The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
516. vs.
Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Leather et al.,
Appellants,
313. vs.
Mark J. White.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Bernard Cypress Company, Limited, Petitioner,
419. vs.
Louis Pfister.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
474. vs.
J. W. C. Bell, Jr., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
553. vs.
P. O. Warrick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Columbia Ribbon Company,
Petitioner,
683. vs.
Marshall's, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Worthington,
Petitioner,
685. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Park Falls Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
699. vs.
Everette H. Burlingame, Former Acting Collector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Etha A. Dahlgren et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
707. vs.
Winthrop Dahlgren.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of

counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

South York Brewing Company et al.,
Petitioners,
711. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

August Tammio, Petitioner,
702. vs.
Panama Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to file within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Pauline Fink,
Petitioner,
698. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby,

advanced, and assigned for argument on Monday, December 8th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elkton Electric Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas W. Perkins et al., Receivers. 416. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Dominick Didato, Appellant, vs. William C. Hecht, U. S. Marshal. 133. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Abe Silverstein, Appellant, vs. WilliamC. Hecht, U. S. Marshal. 134. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Wagner,
Plaintiff in Error,
162. vs.
The City of Milwaukee et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
117. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Ferguson, Individually and as Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
713. vs.
Thomas Dickson et al., Executors.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jackson A. Dykman and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the respondents.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
733. vs.
Charles H. Ludington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. William D. Guthrie, Mr. Hugh Satterlee, Mr. William R. Perkins, and Mr. Ralph B. Evans for the respondent.

R. H. Clemmer, Attorney in Fact,
Petitioner,
360. vs.
Arthur L. Ross et al.

On motion of Mr. H. H. Rumble in that behalf, the mandate in this cause was granted.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank M. Swacker, Mr. James B. Diggs, and Mr. R. L. Batts for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr.Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
239. vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. F. M. Swacker, of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Steele, Appellant,
235. vs.
The United States of America.
John F. Steele, Plaintiff in Error,
636. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance and consolidate these cases for hearing, as one case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On motion of Mr. J. F. Finnerty in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company,
Petitioner,
160. vs.
Arthur H. Van Pelt.

On motion of Mr. A. M. Hartung in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The motion of Mr. A. M. Hartung for leave to take part in the oral argument herein was denied.

Alexander Lumber Company, Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari
716. vs. herein to the United States Circuit
Aetna Casualty & Surety Company et al. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald C. Dobbins for the petitioner.

A. Shapiro & Son, Inc., Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari
722. vs. herein to the United States Circuit
Max G. Cohen, Trustee. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barnett E. Kopelman and Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne for the petitioner, and by Mr. David Haar for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari
725. vs. herein to the Supreme Court of the
Kate B. McAlister, Administratrix etc. State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. O'B. Cooper, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. F. G. Tompkins, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the respondent.

John C. Brewer et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court
166. vs. of the State of California.
Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Newark et al.,
Appellants,
351. vs. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. V. Lindabury for
The Central Railroad Company
the appellee Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and concluded by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen for the appellee the Port of New York Authority.

National Paper & Type Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
330. vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc.

Barclay & Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
547. vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. P. J. McCumber for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in error.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited,
Appellant,
343. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The motion for leave to intervene herein on behalf of Lazarus G. Joseph, Receiver etc., was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion Butler in that behalf; and the motion denied.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited,
Appellant,
343. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the appellant, and by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K.Green,Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo V. Morgan, It is ordered that George W. P. Whip, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Henry Berger, Esquire, of Malvern, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that William L. Robinson, Esquire, of Mt. Vernon, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that William R. Higgins, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana; and Clair McTurnan, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, Executive Counsel of Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, et al., Appellants,
661. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Wallerstein for the appellants.

Compagnie Internationale de Produits Alimentaires, S. A., Appellant,
412. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the appellant, and by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellees.

In the matter of the petition of East River Towing Company, Inc., etc.,
81. Petitioner.

On motion of Mr. James A. Gray for Frank P. Deering, Halsey L. Hixford and Robert M. Jones, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. C. Sherwood for the appellant, continued by Mr. William S. Butler and Mr. James A. Gray for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the appellant.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,
345. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works of the State of Washington.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Dunbar and Mr. H. C. Brodie for the appellee in support of the motion. This cause was argued by Mr. J. H. Dunbar for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Merrill Moores for the appellant.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Logan Rives.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward R. Johnston, it is ordered that Henry J. Darby, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that O. Z. Ide, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Hiter, It is ordered that Jesse Kimball Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Logan Rives.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the defendant in error.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant,
401. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites &Chemical Corporation.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellant, and by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellee.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
191. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
192. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
193. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Ellis L. Orvis and Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. D. Gettig and Mr. H. B. Spangler for the respondents.

Ozark Pipe Line Corporation, Appellant,
181. vs.
Roy Monier et al., constituting the State Tax Commission, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Truman Post Young for the appellant, and by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett and Mr. C. Henry Caruthers for the appellees.

Proclamation being made Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E.Hilton Jackson, It is ordered that J. Louis Krupsaw, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Franklin C. Parks, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; James C. Ledbetter, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas; and Henry J. Richardson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, It is ordered that Eugene Underwood, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend, It is ordered that Henry Stewart McDonald, Jr., Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of

this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Keeling, It is ordered that John W. Barry, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Charles Stanley Thompson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward R. Johnston, It is ordered that Vincent D. Wyman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Mattison, It is ordered that Walter Byron Caughlan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Semmes, It is ordered that Frank H. Borden, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Mason Welch, It is ordered that James A. Dunn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., and The United States of America,
258. vs.
Norwegian Barque "Thekla", Her Tackle, etc.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Steele, Appellant,
235. vs.
The United States of America.
John F. Steele, Plaintiff in Error,
636. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate and advance these cases, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases consolidated and assigned for argument on Monday, February 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, Executive Council of Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, et al., Appellants,
661. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, with No. 689, heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief

Ex parte In the matter of Ivan Glavadanovic.
——. Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and to file a motion for a writ of mandamus without printing, herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
733. vs.
Charles H. Ludington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Williams et al., Petitioners,
700. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
462. vs.
Ezra A. Sliger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
518. vs.
M. M. Cohn Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General,
Petitioner,
533. vs.
M. A. Pharr Cotton Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

December 1, 1924.

John Beartail et al., Petitioners,
577. vs.
Pauline F. Halsell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Ferguson, Individually and as Collector etc.,

Petitioner,

713. vs.

Thomas Dickson et al., Executors.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Lumber Company, Petitioner,

716. vs.

Aetna Casualty & Surety Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Shapiro & Son, Inc., Petitioner,

722. vs.

Max G. Cohen, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for theSecond Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Ford,
277. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator of the Estateof Victor M.Sturgis,deceased.
Union Iron Works Company
278. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.
Reginald N. Geare
279. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.
Frank L. Wagner
280. vs.
Nicholas Apfelbaum, as Administrator of the Estate of Rose Urdong,deceased.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that this certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for the reason that the form of certificate by the Court of Appeals of questions to be answered is not within the requirement of Section 239 of the Judicial Code.

November 21, 1924.

And it is further ordered that the judgment entered in these caseson November 21st last be, and the same is hereby, modified to read as follows:

The certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia in each case is dismissed for the reason that the questions or propositions of law certified therein are not such as may be certified under Section 251 of the Judicial Code. See Biddle v. Luvisch, decided November 17th last, and cases cited.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
116. vs.
Rena Napoleon and Rosa Napoleon.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
214. vs.
C. L. Babcock, as State Treasurer of the State of Washington.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective

parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian etc., Plaintiff in Error,
215. vs.
C. W. Clausen, as State Auditor of the State of Washington.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
319. vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The United States of America ex rel. Pauline Fink, Petitioner,
698. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, January 12th next.

Thomas Kannellos, Plaintiff in Error,
549. vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

The motion to advance and consolidate this cause with cases Nos. 168 and 179 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Dunn in that behalf.

Harold Taylor, Trustee under the will of Mary E. Erskine, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
720. vs.
Harry W. Voss, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Taylor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry B. Walker for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
727. vs.
Byrd J. Boone.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. James P. Green, and Mr. Merritt U. Hayden for the petitioner.

Herman L. Copeland, etc., Petitioner,
738. vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emanuel M. Newlett for the petitioner.

Lyda Fisher and Edward L. Cabell, Petitioners,
744. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Thomas Kannelles, Plaintiff in Error,
549. vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frank L. Fawcett for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Walter L. Stickel, Appellant,
433. vs.
John E. C. Kohlsaat et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appel-

lant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Philip Grossman,
24, Original. Petitioner.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. Louis J. Behan for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Amos C. Miller for the respondents, by Mr. F. Bruce Johnstone for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Attorney General Stone for the United States as amicus curiae.

The Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the appellants, and continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that Elton Watkins, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Edwin A. Price, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that William G. Heiner, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, It is ordered that John W. Palmer, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward R. Johnston, It is ordered that Fred B. Silsbee, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dion S. Birney, It is ordered that Arthur G. Cohen, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. E. R. Johnston for the appellant.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of the appellants that the permanent injunction granted by the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan in this cause on the 4th day of January, 1924, be suspended until the determination of this appeal,

It is now here ordered that the said injunction be, and the same is hereby, suspended until the determination of this appeal by this Court.

December 2, 1924.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
3. Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the complainant, continued by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. Thornton Hardie in behalf of L. M. Crawford as amicus curiae by special leave of Court. Case was ordered referred to a Master for findings of fact to be reported to the Court.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
12. Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the complainant, and continued by Mr. Oliver Dean for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, It is ordered that John V. Sees, Esquire, of Huntington, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Marquette, It is ordered that Richard S. Doyle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
12, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

Frank W. Clancy for the complainant.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Oliver Dean for the defendant, by Mr. W. C. Williams for the defendant, and concluded by Mr.

The United States, Appellant,
353. vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. Duffield Mitchell for the appellant, and by Mr. Simon Lyon for the appellee.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
25. vs.
The Village of Hubbard, Ohio.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
26. vs.
The City of Wellsville, Ohio.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas H. Hogsett for the appellant The Steubenville, East Liverpool & Beaver Valley Traction Company, continued by Mr. Edmond H. Moore for the appellee The Village of Hubbard, Ohio, by Mr. Charles Boyd for the appellee The City of Wellsville, Ohio, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
332. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Alliance Coal Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
333. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
334. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company, Plaintiff in Error,
335. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that W. H. Mitchell, Esquire, of Florence, State of ~~Oklahoma~~ Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys, It is ordered that John P. Phillips, Esquire, of Chillicothe, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin W. Smith, It is ordered that Carl E. Glock, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys, It is ordered that Webb I. Vorys, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that D. C. Hull, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. G. Maul, It is ordered that Mark Townsend, Jr., Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 3, Orig'l.

It is ordered that this cause be referred to Charles Warren, Esquire, as a Special Master with directions that he make special findings on all material questions of fact and report the same to the Court with his recommendations respecting the decree to be entered. The Master shall accord to the parties a full hearing on all questions in the cause, whether of fact or of law, and shall base his findings and recommendations on the entire record as heretofore made and printed, including the several documents and papers mentioned in the stipulations appearing in the record. When the Master's Report is received the Clerk shall have the same printed, and the cause shall then be set down for hearing before the Court on the findings and recommendations of the Master and such exceptions thereto as may be presented by either State.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 332.

Alliance Coal Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 333.

The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 334.

Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 335.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
423. vs.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. W. Terry for the appellant, continued by Mr. T. D. Gresham for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. T. J. Norton for the appellant.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company, Plaintiff in Error,
316. vs.
Lars Dahl.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. G. Mail for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ralph G. Barclay for the defendant in error.

The Palmer Brothers Company, Appellant,
402. vs.
D. E. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection in Pittsburgh of the Department of Labor and Industry, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin W. Smith for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. E. Lowry Humes for the appellee.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Appellant,
83. vs.
The United States.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
89. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellants, and submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis J. Behan, It is ordered that Charles V. Barrett, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that William A. Charters, Esquire, of Gainesville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom T. Connally, It is ordered that Claude V. Birkhead, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas; and Clark C. Wren, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Angus A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that George E. Brammer, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Riley Smith, Plaintiff in Error,
136. vs.
The State of Nebraska.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

Ray A. Lower, Plaintiff in Error,
137. vs.
The State of Nebraska.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
138. vs.
The Sioux Falls Coffee & Spice Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.
Martin L. Pipes for the appellant.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Will R. King and Mr.

F. A. Cocke, Plaintiff in Error,
295. vs.
Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles N. Burch for the defendants in error, and submitted by Mr. Frederick H. Lotterhos and Mr. George Butler for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
391. vs.
Joseph Weissman, Jacob Anschelowitz, Maurice L. Estoff, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Benjamin Slade for the defendants in error.

John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate,

Appellant,

596. vs.

Mally S. Daugherty.

This cause was argued by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellant, and by Mr. Charles I. Vorys and Mr. John P. Phillips for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore E. Burton, It is ordered that Arthur E. Brueckner, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio; and Joseph I. Eagleson, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, It is ordered that Robert H. Ledbetter, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Paul Carrington, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Baxter, It is ordered that Wilbur F. Thayer, Jr., Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, It is ordered that Sidney D. Redmond, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. Devlin, It is ordered that S. W. Downey, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that Tom Poe, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Ethan B. Stroud, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward B. Denison, It is ordered that Charles C. Murrah, Esquire, of Herrin, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Noel, It is ordered that John Wallace Young, Esquire, of New York City; and U. S. Lesh, Esquire, of Indianapolis, Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Louis G. Caldwell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Joseph B. Fleming, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

John V. Campbell,
Plaintiff in Error,
73. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

In the matter of Petition of East River Towing Company, Inc., for Limitation of Liability of Steamtug "Edward", Her Engines, etc.,
81. Petitioner.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative; and that the second question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
102. vs.
The Formica Insulation Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER. It is now here ordered by this Court that the cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, February 23d next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for Tuesday, February 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
319. vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Kannellos,
Plaintiff in Error,
549. vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
353. vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
332. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alliance Coal Mining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
333. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
334. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company, Plaintiff in Error,
335. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Palmer Brothers Company, Appellant,
402. vs.
D. E. Weaver, Chief of Bureau, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
423. vs.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. A. Cooke, Plaintiff in Error,

295. vs.

Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad and Steamship Company et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miller's Indemnity Underwriters, Plaintiff in Error,

502. vs.

Mrs. Nellie Boudreaux Braud, etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Herman L. Copeland, etc., Petitioner,

738. vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lyda Fisher et al., Petitioners,

744. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, December 15, 1924, until Monday, January 5, 1925.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond, Snyder & Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
Baltimore Grain Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

The joint request to restore these cases to the call for Monday, January 5th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
120. vs.
T. H. Dunn et al.

The joint request to restore this case to the call for Monday, January 5th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
129. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

The joint request to restore this case to the call for Monday, January 12th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Joshua W. Miler, formerly U. S. Collector, Plaintiff in Error,
53. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

The joint request to restore this case to the call for Monday, January 5th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
733. vs.
Charles H. Ludington.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Pennsylvania Mining Company,
Petitioner,
749. vs.
The United Mine Workers of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Warrum, Mr. C. L. Grant, and Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the respondents.

Ex parte In the matter of William J. Veach,
—, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the petitioner.

William Ash Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
354. vs.
The Reclamation Board of the State of California et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert T. Devlin in behalf of Mr. Stephen W. Downey and Mr. Bradford M. Melvin for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. W. Dorsey for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Willis H. Roberts, Petitioner,
724. vs.
Flora Taylor et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert T. Devlin and Mr. William H. Devlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Metson for the respondents.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
709 & 710. Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George B. Newton Coal Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen S. Armsted in that behalf.

Mariano Viamonte Fernandez,
Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, U. S. Marshal etc.

The motion to reduce the bail herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellant; with leave to Mr. H. B. Elgar to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

William J. Juneau, Petitioner,
731. vs.
The Wisconsin Tax Commission of the State of Wisconsin etnal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Trottman for the petitioner.

Clifford I. Vorhees et al.,
Petitioners,
735. vs.
Grinnell Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Enright for the petitioner, and by Mr. John J. Stamler for the respondent.

C. Levensaler et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
736. vs.
The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioners.

Indian Refining Company, Petitioner,
745. vs.
John C. Taylor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Noel for the petitioner, and by Mr. U. S. Lesh for the respondent.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York, Petitioner,
755. vs.
U. S. Railroad Administration (New York Central Railroad Company), etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl Sherman and Mr. E. C. Aiken for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the respondent.

Red Seal Oil Company, Appellant,
219. vs.
Albert Bittner et al.

This cause was submitted pursuant to the provisions of Twentieth Rule, by Mr. Edward H. S. Martin for the appellant, and by Mr. O. W. Dynes and Mr. M. L. Bluhm for the appellees.

J. C. Crowson, Plaintiff in Error,
590. vs.
Michael Cody et al.

This cause was submitted, pursuant to the provisions of the Twentieth Rule, by Mr. W. A. Gunter for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Fred S. Ball for the defendants in error.

A. A. Holmes, Plaintiff in Error,
494. vs.
L. W. Bronaugh.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Hatchett for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Reford Bond for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
140. vs.
O. R. Houghton.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. D. Gresham and Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

L. B. Morton et al., Appellants,
146. vs.
Cheparney Larney, a minor, et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson and Mr. Joseph L. Hull for the appellants, and by Mr. Elias J. Van Court for the appellees.

DeWitt T. Law, Plaintiff in Error,
560. vs.
The United States of America.

Leave was granted Mr. DeWitt T. Law to appear and present oral argument prohac vice, on motion of Mr. Thomas J. Walsh in that behalf. This cause was argued by Mr. DeWitt T. Law for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

Five and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of this cause, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1924 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Edward J. Redington, Esquire, of New York City; and Edward A. Craighill, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that James A. Fee, Jr., Esquire, of Pendleton, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Michael H. Cardozo, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that David Paine, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis J. Behan, It is ordered that Charles R. Seroomb, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that H. K. Toney, Esquire, of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas; and W. B. Sorrells, Esquire, of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States, Appellant,
353. vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

On motion of Mr. Simon Lyon for the appellee, the mandate in this cause was granted.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner,
147. vs.
A. E. Manry.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., and Mr. I. J. Hofmayer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Douglas Feagan for the respondent.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
161. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Daniel E. Kirby for the Mississippi Valley States as amici curiae, by special leave; by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee; by Mr. Andrew B. Dougherty for the States of Michigan, Indiana, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Minnesota as amici curiae, by special leave; by Mr. Harvey D. Goulder for the Great Lakes Carriers' Association as amicus curiae, by special leave; by Mr. Joseph B. Fleming for the appellee; and concluded by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock for the appellant.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
338. vs.
Butter-worth Judson Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that Allan C. Rowe, Esquire, of Summit, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, It is ordered that James J. Farnan, Esquire, of Laporte, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Sidney H. Block, Esquire, of Waukegan, State of Illinois; and Arthur Bulkley, Esquire, of Waukegan, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Driscoll, It is ordered that John J. O'Brien, Esquire, of Saugus, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson, It is ordered that Everett E. Kirkpatrick, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Henry M. Holden, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that John P. Devitt, Esquire, of Muscatine, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Ramseyer, It is ordered that E. Raymond Tipton, Esquire, of Muscatine, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton Watkins, It is ordered that William D. Burnett, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Hervey L. Woodward, Esquire, of Worcester, Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
29. vs.
The United States.

The motion for further argument in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
338. vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellants, by Mr. William C. Breed for the appellee National Newark & Essex Banking Company of Newark, New Jersey, and concluded by Mr. David Paine for the appellees Chase National Bank et al.

William Leather and Leon K. Leigh, Appellant,
313. vs.
Mark J. White.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the appellants, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

The United States of America, Appellant,
139. vs.
Steamship "Panoil".

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellant, and by Mr. Walter Carroll for the appellee.

Kunhardt & Company, Inc., Appellant,
141. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

L. Richardson & Company, Inc., Appellant,
142. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Bunn, It is ordered that P. L. Solether, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Fredericks, It is ordered that Charles F. Hutchins, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; and Byron C. Hanna, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Cohane, It is ordered that Regene Freund Cohane, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carmi A. Thompson, It is ordered that Osborne Mitchell, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Burk Mann, Esquire, of Marianna, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Wallerstein, It is ordered that Thomas M. Hyndman, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James H. DeVeuve et al.,
Petitioners,
708. vs.
Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company et al.

On cross petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Dale A. Drain, of counsel for the petitioners, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the cross petition for a writ of certiorari herein as to the remaining petitioners James H. DeVeuve and Mary C. DeVeuve,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the cross petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as to the remaining petitioners James H. DeVeuve and Mary C. DeVeuve.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al.,
Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph P. Mulqueen in that behalf.

L. Richardson & Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
142. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

United States Bedding Company,
Appellant,
143. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
148. vs.
B. W. McCarthy et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. D. Gresham and Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

Nicholas Webster, Appellant,
149. vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Muscatine Lighting Company, Appellant,
150. vs.
The City of Muscatine et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Chamberlain for the appellant, continued by Mr. J. F. Devitt and Mr. E. Raymond Tipton for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William Chamberlain for the appellant.

The Board of County Commissioners of Barber County, State of Kansas, Plaintiff in Error,
151. vs.
Carl J. Peterson, Bank Commissioner etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Chester I. Long for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that Allen P. Dodd, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, It is ordered that Charles Green Smith, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Miller, It is ordered that Heber McHugh, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that Willis H. Meredith, Esquire, of Poplar Bluff, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Glenn C. Mead, It is ordered that Walter Biddle Saul, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders, It is ordered that Kenneth Gardner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tampa-Inter-Ocean Steamship Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
91. vs.
The State of Louisiana.
J. Zach Spearing in that behalf.

The motion for leave to reargue the principles in No. 141, October Term, 1923, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

The Board of County Commissioners of Barber County, State of Arkansas, Plaintiff in Error,
151. vs.
Carl J. Peterson, Bank Commissioner etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Chester I. Long for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. John G. Egan for the defendant in error.

Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error,
152. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.
Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company, Petitioner,
179. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. L. Solether for the plaintiff in error and petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Edmund L. Ebert et al., Petitioners,
153. vs.
Harry P. Poston.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. J. M. Hally for the petitioner, continued by Mrs. Regene Freund Cohane and Mr. Louis Cohane for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. E. H. Groefsema for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that H. E. Crowley, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas; and Robert Leyland Wilkins Thompson, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, It is ordered that Charles T. Cowenhoven, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. Wood, It is ordered that Alfred Evens, Esquire, of Greencastle, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. A. Collins, It is ordered that J. H. Currie, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene B. Van Veen, It is ordered that Frank B. Ober, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. M. Doyle, It is ordered that Bryan H. Tivnen, Esquire, of Mattoon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. W. Dent, It is ordered that F. A. Kern, Esquire, of Ellensburg, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Aetna Life Insurance Company and Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, Plaintiff in Error,
62. vs.
Mrs. Pearl Stone Dunken, Administratrix of the Estate of W. J. Dunken, deceased.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company and The Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
33. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 3 of Sevier County, Arkansas, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

391. vs.

Joseph Weissman, Jacob Anschelowitz, Maurice L. Katoff, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of ~~Massachusetts.~~ Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

National Paper and Type Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

320. vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Barclay & Company, Incorporated,

Plaintiff in Error,

547. vs.

William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Southern District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of William J. Veach,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mariano Viamonte Fernandez, Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, U. S. Marshal etc.

On consideration of the motion to reduce the bail in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
29. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion for a further argument in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al., Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond Snyder & Company.
Federal Trade Commission, Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
Baltimore Grain Company.
Federal Trade Commission, Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to restore these cases to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26,
It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant, 120. vs. T. H. Dunn et al. On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector etc., Petitioner, 129. vs. The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey. On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joshua W. Miles, Formerly U. S. Collector, Plaintiff in Error, 53. vs. Samuel J. Graham. On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, 733. vs. Charles H. Ludington. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Plaintiff in Error, 709 & 710. vs. George B. Newton Coal Company. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court

that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
619. vs.
A. J. Mullens.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Wyoming County, State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Wyoming County, State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. B. Engel, Petitioner,
697. vs.
J. O. Davenport et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. E. Schaff, as Receiver etc.,
Petitioner,
580. vs.
Mrs. Beerah Ridlehuber, Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willis H. Roberts, Petitioner,
724. vs.
Flora Taylor et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clifford I. Vorhees et al.,
Petitioners,
735. vs.
Grinnell Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had. It is now here ordered by this Court

C. Levensaler et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
736. vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Mining Company,
Petitioner,
749. vs.
The United Mine Workers of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York, Petitioner,
753. vs.
U. S. Railroad Administration (New York Central Railroad Company).

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Ash Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
354. vs.
Reclamation Board of the State of California, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Seal Oil Company,
Appellant,
219. vs.
Albert Bittner et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Crowson, Plaintiff in Error,
590. vs.
Michael Cody et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
140. vs.
O. R. Houghton.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Muscatine Lighting Company, Appellant, 150. vs. The City of Muscatine et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Board of County Commissioners of Barber County, State of Kansas, Plaintiff in Error, 151. vs. Carl J. Peterson, Bank Commissioner etc. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Leather et al., Appellants, 313. vs. Mark J. White. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United StatesCircuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the ~~said~~ District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
527. vs.
Harriet Rogers Flannery et al., Executors etc.

On motion of Mr. Newell W. Ellison in behalf of Mr. Richard W. Hale and Mr. Reginald H. Smith, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

Georgine Iselin, Appellant,
495. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Newell W. Ellison in that behalf.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
571. vs.
The Department of Public Works of Washington et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blaine Mallan in behalf of Mr. John H. Dunbar, Mr. Raymond W. Clifford, and Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
485. vs.
Richard E. Collins et al., etc.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
486. vs.
Richard E. Collins et al., etc.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in that behalf.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant,
348. vs.
Lavina B. Donaldson.

The motion of the appellee to dissolve the injunction herein or to require the appellant to give bond, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. B. Gardner in behalf of counsel for the appellee, with leave to the appellant to file opposition thereto on or before the 22d instant.

Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company, Appellant,
624. vs.
W. R. Adamson et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Kern in ~~that~~ behalf of Mr. Carroll B. Graves for the appellees in support of the motion, and by

Mr. George Donworth, Mr. Elmer E. Todd, and Mr. John C. Higgins for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Frank S. Ashley, Petitioner,
740. vs.
C. Arthur Eby, Trustee of the Estate of Frank M. Young, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles G. Baldwin and Mr. G. Ridgely Sappington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sylvan Hayes Lauchheimer for the respondent.

Pullman Couch Company, Petitioner,
746 &
747 vs.
J. A. Eshelman, Trustee.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob G. Grossberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Aubrey L. Brooks for the respondent.

Reading Company, Successor of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
748. vs.
John L. Koons, Administrator.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Heebner for the petitioner.

Jacob H. Fink, Petitioner,
751. vs.
Frances F. Peck.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Krupshaw and Mr. E. Hilton Jackson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Ottenberg for the respondent.

Franklin Trust Company, Petitioner,
765. vs.
Advance Oil Company, Bankrupt, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. T. M. McCready for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Breene for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 5th, 1925, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Pablo G. Cornista, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Rufino Luna, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Harold E. Stiles, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blaine Mallan, It is ordered that Charles William Strickling, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Parrell, It is ordered that

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that Theodore B. Benson, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, It is ordered that Lester Shields Parsons, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Farrell, It is ordered that Willis Crane, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that William J. Berne, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Peery, It is ordered that Melvin G. Ely, Esquire, of Jonesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that Walter Kenyon Lloyd, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that Myer Rosenbush, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is now here ordered that Joseph Bernstein, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Riley Strickland, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Frank Irvine, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Bailey, It is ordered that John W. Putnam, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll G. Walter, It is ordered that John T. Loughran, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Dodge, It is ordered that Alan H. Mann, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Walter H. Sprague, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that W. B. Symmes, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Glenn Y. Wells, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The United States, Appellant,

98. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Charles A. Morrow.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Kunhardt & Company, Inc.,

141. Appellant, vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

L. Richardson & Company, Inc.,

142. Appellant, vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Erie Coal & Coke Corporation,
Appellant,
78. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
115. vs. On writ of certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Freda Groeger, Administratrix of the Estate of John O. Groeger, deceased. the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc.,
et al., Appellants,
104. vs. Appeal from the District Court of the
United States for the Southern Dis-
Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al. trict of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,

105. vs.

Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, and Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Harry Satz, Appellant,

106. vs.

Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, and Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Fort Worth, Texas, Appellant,

487. vs.

W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee, and The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Nicholas Webster, Appellant,

149. vs.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior; J. George Wright, Superintendent of the Osage Agency, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill for want of a necessary party.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

L. B. Morton, Bettie, Kizzie Gouge, Okohumpulla, et al., Appellants,

146. vs.

Cheparney Larney, a minor, and Bennie Green, His Legal Guardian.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Pennsylvania-Ohio Power & Light Company,

Appellants,

25. vs.

The Village of Hubbard, Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion and decree of this Court.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America, The Steubenville, East Liverpool and Beaver Valley Traction Company, and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

26. vs.

The City of Wellsville, Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

John G. Morrison, Jr., et al.,

Appellants,

112. vs.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Charles H. Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

United States Bedding Company,
Appellant,
143. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

DeWitt T. Law,
Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the United States Circuit
550. vs. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
139. vs. Appeal from the District Court
Steamship "Panoil". of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
152. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company and Minnesota and International Railway Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
179. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Delaware and Hudson Company, The Albany and Susquehanna Railroad Company, Rensselaer and Saratoga Railroad Company, et al.,
Appellants,
212. vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of

New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

316. vs.

Lars Dahl.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited,

Appellant,

345. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Compagnie Internationale de Produits Alimentaires, S. A.,

Appellant,

412. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States of America, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,

Appellant,

161. vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree for injunction of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, to go into effect in sixty days---without prejudice to any permit that may be issued by the Secretary of War according to law.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James C. Davis, as Director General of Railroads and Agent under Section 206, Transportation Act, 1920,

Petitioner,

147. vs.

A. E. Manry.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of the Appeals of the ~~District of~~ State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Tampa-Inter-Ocean Steamship Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
91. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the motion to reargue the principles of Texas Transport & Terminal Company v. New Orleans, (264 U. S. 150),

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
371. vs.
The Department of Public Works of Washington et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant,
348. vs.
Levina B. Donaldson.

On consideration of the motion to dissolve the injunction or to require a bond herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. A. Holmes, Plaintiff in Error,
494. vs.
L. W. Bronaugh.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company, Appellant,
624. vs.
W. R. Adamson and Lyle Adamson, his wife, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Georgine Iselin, Appellant,
495. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
485. vs.
Richard H. Collins et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
486. vs.
Richard H. Collins et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the

cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
34. vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Embden et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument on all the questions involved, restored to the docket for reargument on all the questions involved, particularly including the following:

No. 1. Whether the North Dakota statute of 1922 differs materially in its provisions and operations from the statute of 1919 which was held invalid by this Court in Lemke v. Farmers Grain Co., 258 U. S. 50, and Lemke v. Homer Farmers Elevator Co., 258 U. S. 65.

No. 2. Whether and to what extent section 17 of the statute of 1922 gives effect to and continues in force the provisions of the statute of 1919.

No. 3. Whether and in what particulars the statute of 1922 encroaches upon the field of regulations occupied by the United States grain standards act or conflicts with that act or with its administration.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
34. vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Embden et al.
Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.
Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
336. vs.
The United States.
Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument on Tuesday, February 24th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company. Petitioner,
727. vs.
Byrd J. Boone.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reading Company, Successor of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
748. vs.
John L. Koons, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company, Appellant,
624. vs.
W. R. Adamson et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luisa Lim, Petitioner,
656. vs.
Tomas Cabigao.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Juneau, Petitioner,
731. vs.
The Wisconsin Tax Commission of the State of Wisconsin et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank S. Ashley, Petitioner,
740. vs.
C. Arthur Eby, Trustee of the Estate of Frank M. Young, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pullman Couch Company,
Petitioner,
746 & 747. vs.
J. A. Eshelman, Trustee.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob H. Fink, Petitioner,
751. vs.
Frances P. Peck.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Franklin Trust Company, Petitioner,
765. vs.
Advance Oil Company, Bankrupt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Depcsit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners,
704. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Refining Company,
Petitioner,
745. vs.
John C. Taylor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
654. vs.
H. L. Smith et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice said:

"Gentlemen of the Bar: Mr. Justice McKenna has announced to us, his colleagues of the Court, his purpose to retire from the Bench. He has presented his resignation to the President, who has accepted it. As his Associates, we have expressed our feelings toward him in a personal letter which I shall now read."

January 5, 1925.

Dear Brother McKenna: Your active membership in this Court is ending after twenty-seven years. The affectionate and charming intimacy of that relation is known only to those who have enjoyed it. Few have been permitted to share it as long as you have. Happy are you with such a retrospect of love, confidence, and usefulness.

What an extended and varied experience you have had! Going with your parents to California at the age of twelfe, you settled in the Golden State a little more than five years after the arrival of the Forty-niners. Your youth and young manhood were spent in the atmosphere of that community's irrepressible enthusiasm and inspiring confidence in its great future.

Admitted to the Bar in 1865, twice District Attorney of your home County, for two years its Representative in your State Legislature, your upward steps carried you to the National House of Representatives, where during four Congresses you served with distinction. Put to the test in one of your electoral campaigns, you declined to yield your convictions on what you deemed sound monetary principles, and in the face of overwhelming adverse local sentiment, you carried again your Congressional District. You attached your colleagues in the House to you by your proved character

and won the admiration and trust of the two great rival Republican leaders of that day.

Against your inclination, President Harrison induced you to become a Federal Circuit Judge, and to begin your experience on the Bench with the birth of a tribunal which has since done much to expedite the administration of national justice--the Circuit Court of Appeals. Five years you had served there when your former congressional colleague, William McKinley, called you to his Cabinet as Attorney General. Then he appointed you a Justice of this Court.

For more than a quarter century you have borne the burden of intense judicial labor. More than half that time you have been the Senior Associate Justice. Your opinions, found in ninety-six volumes of our reports, 170 to 266, number 633. In them you depart from conventional wording and adopt a distinctive style of your own, readily recognized by one familiar with the reports. It is characterized by clearness and force, with a grace of touch and aptness of phrase that stimulates the reader's interest. An examination of thetarray of judgments in cases, many of them of primary public importance, reveals how much of your trained mental energy, long experience with men and affairs, judicial and ethical spirit, and love of country have been poured into them.

Your pride in the Court, its high traditions, and its courage has made deep impression on us who have enjoyed the benefit of your greater experience, example, and esprit de corps. Your fraternal nature, your loyalty towards each of us, your tenderness in times of strain and stress, endear you to us and make us feel deeply sensible of our loss.

May you have many years of happy and well-earned leisure, sweetened by thoughts of the affection and high regard of your Associates, and still more by the knowledge of the good you have wrought in your great and honorable career. Farewell!

Affectionately yours,

WILLIAM H. TAFT,
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES,
WILLIS VAN DEVANTER,
JAMES C. McREYNOLDS,
LOUIS D. BRANDEIS,
GEORGE SUTHERLAND,
PIERCE BUTLER,
EDWARD T. SANFORD.

Mr. Justice McKenna.

January 5, 1925.

My dear Chief Justice and my dear Brethren:-

I thank you for your expressions of esteem. I accept and appreciate even their praise as impelled by personal friendship and as a mark of it. They mitigate the regret--indeed, sorrow--that I feel in separating from the work of a tribunal so necessary to the existence of a constitutional government--a work whose guiding and prompting considerations regarded, it has so adequately performed, and it is assured prediction, will continue to perform.

To this sorrow I shall have the more intimate personal one of a separation from the companionship of you, my dear Chief and Brethren. Here, again, is the mitigation that I shall carry to my retirement, as you so feelingly remind me, abiding reminiscences of it, the honor conferred, the pleasure it gave. And to it will be added the recollection of the association with the eminent men who preceded you in the constitution of the Court and its work. May I say in some emphasis of my service that it was under three Chief Justices, Chief Justice Fuller, Chief Justice White, and you, my dear Chief, which is yet in instance, though soon to become a memory.

I conclude, assured by your words of regard, that while our official relations are this day severed, our personal ones, their pleasure and honor, to me will be continued.

With these words of good-bye go my sincere and affectionate regards.

JOSEPH McKENNA.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al.,
Appellants,
509. vs.
William F. Waldow, Sheriff etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants, this cause was passed.

Charles Sherwin et al., Petitioners,
379. vs.
The United States of America.
for the respondent.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck

The United States, Appellant,
440. vs.
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The United States, Appellant,
441. vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

William H. Edwards, Collector etc.,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

American Steel Foundries
589. vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

C. C. Lewellyn, formerly Collector,
Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
768. vs.
Walter S. Dickey et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

Ex parte In the matter of Charles W. Straughan,
No. ——. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis; and the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Straughan, pro se.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

The motion to advance this cause for hearing following Nos. 444, 709 and 710, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Symmes, Jr., in that behalf.

Edgerton L. Winthrop, Jr., Executor etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
755. vs.
The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Henry L. Stimson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Green Smith and Mr. William Ritchie for the respondents.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The Second Report of the Commissioners was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur D. Kidder and Mr. Arthur A. Stiles in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

It is ordered by this Court that the Commissioners heretofore designated to run, locate, and mark upon the ground portions of the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma, where it follows the course of the Red River, having this day presented a report, with accompanying maps, showing that they have run, located and marked upon the ground the portion of the boundary along the Fort Augur area; that is to say, from the westerly end of the Big Bend area to a southerly extension of the west line of range sixteen west in Oklahoma;

And it appearing from such report that the said Commissioners have transmitted copies of such report, with the accompanying maps, by registered mail to the Attorney General of the United States, the Attorney General of the State of Texas, and the Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and have lodged with the Clerk fifty additional copies of such report and maps for the use of such private interveners as may apply for them;

It is ordered that the said report, with the accompanying maps, be received and filed by the Clerk.

And it is further ordered that all objections or exceptions to such report, if there be any such objections or exceptions, shall be presented to the Court or filed with the Clerk within a period of four weeks from this date; and the period heretofore fixed for presenting or filing such objections or exceptions is limited and modified accordingly.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

D. B. Robertson, Appellant,
739. vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald R. Richberg in that behalf.

Warren Worth Bailey, Petitioner,
825. vs.
Anderson H. Walters.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., and Mr. William A. Maguire for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc., Petitioner,
786 & 787. vs.
E. H. Pringle, Trustee.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin and Mr. Augustine T. Smythe for the petitioner.

Durez Company, Inc., Petitioner,
818. vs.
Bakelite Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Cruse for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of Durez Company, Inc., ——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alan N. Mann and Mr. George E. Cruse for the petitioner.

The United States, Appellant,
527. vs.
Harriet Rogers Flannery et al., Executors etc.

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of William G. Brantley, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The United States of America, Appellant,
767. vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the appellees.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
729. vs.
The State of Oklahoma et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Charles S. Burg, and Mr. Maurice D. Green for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

W. W. Jenkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
752. vs.
North Pole Ice Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner.

Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
756. vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

James C. Davis, Director General, Plaintiff in Error,
759. vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex P. Humphrey, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, and Mr. Charles W. Milner for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. J. P. Hobson for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
761. vs.
Gustav A. Berdon, Administrator.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Eggers, Mr. Morison R. Waite, and Mr. Cassius W. McMullin for the petitioner.

William R. Shelby, Petitioner,
763. vs.
Fred E. Hummel, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vincent D. Wyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lewis J. Jacobson and Mr. E. C. Tourje for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
771. vs.
Abraham Weiss, Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the petitioner.

Evansville Oil and Grease Company et al., Appellants,
773. vs.
Ivy L. Miller, as State Food and Drug Commissioner etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Chamberlin and Mr. Hubert D. Fuller for the appellants in support of the petitioner.

Western National Bank of Baltimore,
Petitioner,
776. vs.
H. Bayly Chapman, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart S. Janney for the petitioner, and by Mr. David A. Pine for the respondent.

John Demos et al., Petitioners,
779. vs.
Chris Xegen et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Lowndes Maury for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. Bruce Kremer for the respondents.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner,
780. vs.
Reuben E. Barber et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts and Mr. George B. Parkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moseley Arthur Keller for the respondents.

L. R. Taylor, alias Bode Taylor, et al., Petitioners,
781. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Stevenson for the petitioner.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
782. vs.
Lester Brock.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Dolman, Mr. M. L. Bell, and Mr. W.F. Dickinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Platt Hubbell for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duncan K. Brent and Mr. Francis R. Cross for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm and Mr. William B. Symmes, Jr., for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company, Petitioner,
785. vs.
The Essex Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Charles A. Browne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lucius E. Varney for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner,
790. vs.
E. G. Simmons, Receiver.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard Haas and Mr. Henry A. Alexander for the petitioner.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
800. vs.
A. M. Murphy et al., Partners etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. W. R. Bleakmore, Mr. A. T. Boys, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

Kintyre Farmers' Co-operative Elevator Company et al.,
Petitioners,
802. vs.
The Midland National Bank of Minneapolis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor E. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Burke, Mr. Andreas Ueland, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, and Mr. Alexander E. Horn for the respondent.

Kintyre Farmers Co-operative Elevator Company et al.,
Petitioners,
803. vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor E. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Burke, Mr. Andreas Ueland, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, and Mr. Alexander E. Horn for the respondent.

Marmarth Co-operative Equity Exchange et al.,
Petitioners,
804. vs.
805.
The Midland National Bank of Minneapolis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor E. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Burke, Mr. Andreas Ueland, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, and Mr. Alexander E. Horn for the respondent.

J. S. Schofield's Sons Company et al., Petitioners,
822. vs.
The Citizens Bank of Moultrie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Orville A. Park and Mr. Sam S. Bennett for the petitioner.

Charles A. Patterson et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
484. vs.
Martha Isabelle Patterson.

This cause was submitted pursuant to the 20th rule by Mr. Theodore Martin for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. D. Fredericks and Mr. William C. Mullendore for the defendant in error.

Crew Levick Company, Plaintiff in Error,
154. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

On motion of Mr. David Wallerstein in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Me-Kah-She-Tun-Kah, et al., Appellants,
156. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Harry A. Van Auken, Plaintiff in Error,
155. vs.
Frank Smith, Sheriff of Larimer County, Colorado.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul W. Lee and Mr. George H. Shaw for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
158. vs.
George V. Halliday et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. A. Samuel Bender for the defendant in error.

Henry Merritt, Appellant,

159. vs.

The United States.

Perkins for the appellant.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and the cause was submitted by Mr. Louis B.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that Elmer E. Ritchie, Esquire, of Valdez, Territory of Alaska; and Charles H. Miller, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Stevenson, It is ordered that H. Earlton Hanes, Esquire, of Herndon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Hitt, It is ordered that Charles E. Orth, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Hitt, It is ordered that C. Arthur Eby, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that William A. Kemp, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Grant, It is ordered that Robert A. Imlay, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Mahmeh, Appellant,
157. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the appellant, and ~~concluded~~ by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee.

William M. Barrett, as President etc., Petitioner,
160. vs.
Arthur H. Van Pelt.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. K. E. Stockton for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Selig Edelman and Mr. Ralph Merriam for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. K. E. Stockton for the petitioner.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
422. vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Edmund Ludwig Ring, deceased.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. G. Briggs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, It is ordered that William Averell Brown, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Mahlon B. Doing, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., It is ordered that Edwin S. Dixon, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania; and J. Shipley Dixon, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Silo Gottlieb, It is ordered that Morris D. Kopple, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, It is ordered that William M. Simmes, of Vinita, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Abe D. Waldauer, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, It is ordered that George E. Elliott, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland A. Newton, It is ordered that Ben L. Shifrin, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland A. Newton, It is ordered that Henry H. Oberschelp, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that S. J. Montgomery, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alvin Richards, It is ordered that Wade H. James, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that Hayes McCoy, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Clyde H. Finley, Receiver, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
671. vs.
United Mine Workers of America et al.

Three and one-half hours was allowed for the argument of this cause. This cause was argued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the defendants in error.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix etc., Petitioner,
273. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Sullivan, It is ordered that Otis E. Maxey, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri; and O. E. Gorman, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry P. Ashurst, It is ordered that John B. Wright, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Belden, It is ordered that Earl H. Jaynes, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Samuel E. Jones, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B.

Swank. It is ordered that Marion Henderson, Esquire, of Pauls Valley, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, It is ordered that Richard E. Shands, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by ~~Mr.~~ Burnita S. Matthews, It is ordered that Miss Grace M. Eddy, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix etc., Petitioner,
273. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the petitioner, by Mr. W. D. Bailey and Mr. Horace Andrews for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee, Petitioner,
389. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 7, of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

This cause was argued by Mr. George B. Rose for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry D. Ashley for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Glenn J. Fairbrook, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, It is ordered that Frederic Coudert Bellinger, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Hampton Barnes, It is ordered that Charles Myers, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that E. A. Walker, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zack Spearing, It is ordered that Frank J. Looney, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana; and E. S. Broussard, Esquire, of New Iberia, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Direction der Disconto-Gesellschaft, Appellant,
676. vs.
United States Steel Corporation et al.

Bank fur Handel und Industrie, Appellant,
677. vs.
United States Steel Corporation et al.

Argument commenced by Mr. John Weld Peck for the appellants; continued by Mr. John Wilson Brown, III, for the appellants; by Mr. Averel Brown for the appellee United States Steel Corporation; and concluded by Mr. Frederick R. Coudert for the appellee Public Trustee.

Benjamin W. Morse, Appellant,
597. vs.
The United States of America.

Harry F. Morse, Appellant,
598. vs.
The United States of America.

Argued by Mr. Nash Rockwood for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellee.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
444. vs.
The Archibald McNeil & Sons Company.

Argument commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. George Deming for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, it is ordered that Heartsill Ragon, Esquire, of Clarksville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Carrigan, It is ordered that Fred L. Wallace, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas; and B. L. Agerton, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Ernest Michael Fuller, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Elliott, It is ordered that John Kindred Gillette, Esquire, of Long Island City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Wallerstein, It is ordered that Morris Hillquit, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solomon P. Roderick, It is ordered that Isadore J. Berkson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Carlyle R. Barnett, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. H. McCormick, It is ordered that Ada L. Sawyer, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine, It is ordered that Carroll A. Wilson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Michigan Public Utilities Commission, Ralph Duff, William W. Potter, et al., etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Coral W. Duke, doing business as Duke Cartage Company.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.
283.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Ozark Pipe Line Corporation,
Appellant,
181. vs.
Roy Monier and George M.Hages, constituting the State Tax Commission of the State of Missouri, and Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General of the State of Missouri.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Edmund L. Ebert, Andrew J. Keary, and Ella R. Keary,
Petitioners,
153. vs.
Harry P. Poston..

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,
95. vs.
Szejua Waldman, and her minor children, et al.

On petition for rehearing, the order of the Circuit Court of Appeals discharging the relators and releasing their bail is reversed; and the cause is remanded to the District Court. The relators are remanded to the custody of the Commissioner of Immigration, with the right to appeal to the Secretary of Labor for a de-

finite finding on the issues, first whether Mrs. Waldman is relieved from the test as to language because she is a refugee from religious persecution, second whether if Mrs. Waldman was subject to the language test in Yiddish, the test given complied with the statute, and third whether the lameness of Zenia Waldman is likely to make her a public charge. If the Secretary shall find the language test of Mrs. Waldman to be required and the one already had to be legally inadequate, another shall be ordered. Nothing herein shall prejudice application, first on behalf of Zenia Waldman to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor to accept satisfactory security against her becoming a public charge and on its being furnished to admit her to this country. Second, on behalf of all the respondents for their release on bail pending compliance with the foregoing by the Secretary of Labor and his subordinates. Failing the granting and hearing of the appeal to the Secretary above provided within thirty days after the coming down of this mandate, the relators and their bail are to be discharged.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

North Carolina Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
322. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause restored to the call and assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Straughan, No.———. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and for ~~a petition for~~ a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Durex Company, Inc., ___. Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

January 12, 1925.

Charles Sherwin et al., Petitioners,
379. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
768. vs.
Walter S. Dickey and Ralph Ellis.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
440. vs.
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
441. vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

January 12, 1925.

American Steel Foundries
589. vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Collector etc., Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. B. Robertson,
Appellant,
739. vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is

hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
767. vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 9th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William O'Hara et al.,
Petitioners,
772. vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
785. vs.
Essex Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dures Company, Inc., Petitioner,
816. vs.
Bakelite Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
458. vs.
Bernice S. Graham.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
725. vs.
Kate B. McAlister, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
729. vs.
The State of Oklahoma et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. W. Jenkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
752. vs.
North Pole Ice Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Egerton L. Winthrop, Jr., Executor etc., et al., Petitioners,
755. vs.
The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
761. vs.
Gustav A. Berdon, Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Shelby, Petitioner,
763. vs.
Fred H. Hummel, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western National Bank of Baltimore,
Petitioner,
776. vs.
R. Bayly Chapman, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Demos et al., Petitioners,
779. vs.
Chris Yegen et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. R. Taylor, alias Bode Taylor, et al.,
Petitioners,
781. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
782. vs.
Lester Brook.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner,
790. vs.
E. G. Simmons, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kintyre Farmers Cooperative Elevator Company et al., Petitioners,
802. vs.
The Midland National Bank of Minneapolis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kintyre Farmers Cooperative Elevator Company et al., Petitioners,
803. vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marmarth Cooperative Equity Exchange et al., Petitioners,
804. vs.
The Midland National Bank of Minneapolis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marmarth Cooperative Equity Exchange et al., Petitioners,
805. vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. S. Schofield's Sons Company et al., Petitioners,
822. vs.
Citizens Bank of Moultrie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren Worth Bailey, Petitioner,
825. vs.
Anderson H. Walthers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tampa-Inter-Ocean Steamship Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
91. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. Patterson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
484. vs.
Martha Isabelle Patterson.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ne-Kah-Wah-She-Tun-Kah et al.,
Appellants,
156. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry A. Van Auken,
Plaintiff in Error,
155. vs.
Frank Smith, Sheriff of Larimer County, Colorado.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
158. vs.
George V. Halliday et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
17, Orig'l. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, et al.

IN EQUITY.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendants, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cement Manufacturers Protective Association et al.,
Appellants,
551. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc.,
Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Welch, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

See order on 4/19.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc.,
Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

This cause being on the regular call, and it appearing to the Court that John G. Milburn of New York City, counsel for the appellant, has been suddenly stricken ill and therefore unable to argue this cause, and Frank S. Grant, counsel for the City of Portland, having consented to a postponement for hearing this cause under such conditions, and owing to the fact that the City of Portland has been put to the expense of having its City Attorney journey from Portland, Oregon, to Washington, D. C., to present this cause, it has been agreed by all counsel that the City be reimbursed by the appellant for its expenses in the sum agreed upon by counsel; and it is therefore ordered that this cause be passed under the provisions of Section 9 of Rule 26.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Forrest P. Taylor, Appellant,
242. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellant.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
21, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for substitution of Commissioner herein, and that new testimony be admitted, was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. A. L. Sawyer for the complainant.

Saganore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
792. vs.
The Mountain Water Supply Company et al.

Saganore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
793. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

Saganore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
794. vs.
Dunbar Water Supply Company.

Saganore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
795. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ex rel. The Attorney General.

Saganore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
796. vs.
The Mountain Water Supply Company

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
797. vs.
Westmoreland Water Company et al.
Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
798. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ex rel.
The Attorney General.
Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
799. vs.
Westmoreland Water Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Smith, Mr. E. C. Higbee, and Mr. William M. Robinson for the petitioners, and by Mr. George W. Woodruff, Mr. George E. Alter, and Mr. James S. Moorhead for the respondents.

John H. Morse, Appellant,
723. vs.
The United States.

The motion that the rule as to printing the record and briefs in this cause be waived was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Morse, pro se.

Ex parte In the matter of Frank C. Mebane et al.,
____.
Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Catchings for the petitioners.

The People of the United States ex rel. Benjamin Catchings,
Petitioner,
___.
Orig'l. vs.
The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Catchings, pro se.

Ellis M. Black,
Plaintiff in Error,
534. vs.
Lura W. Black.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John S. Black for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al.,
Appellants,
195. vs.
A. Sardell.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel.

Corby Estate, Plaintiff in Error,
562. vs.
The City of St. Joseph.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. H. K. White for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John E. Dolman for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Standard Oil Company,
Petitioner,
778. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. P. Whip for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, and Mr. Frederick R. Conway, for the respondents.

Henry S. MacPherson, Trustee,
Petitioner,
809. vs.
Massachusetts Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the petitioner.

Banco di Roma, Plaintiff in Error,
830. vs.
Philippine National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. John T. Loughran for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
444. vs.
The Archibald McNeil & Sons Company, Inc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Demming for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
709. vs.
George B. Newton Coal Company.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
710. vs.
George B. Newton Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Allan S. Olmsted, 2d, for the defendant in error.

The United States, Appellant,

527. vs.

Harriet Rogers Flannery et al., Executors etc.

On motion of Mr. Arthur Ballantine in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The United States, Appellant,

527. vs.

Harriet Rogers Flannery, et al., Executors, etc..

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, and by Mr. Edward S. Burling for the appellees.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector,

Petitioner,

735. vs.

Charles H. Ludington.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine, It is ordered that George E. Cleary, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Walter Perry Johnson, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Dalzell, It is ordered that Charles Hann, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Loren F. Vaughn, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U.

Fletcher, It is ordered that Scott M. Loftin, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Frank Redd, Esquire, of Sarasota, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edgar S. Appleby et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
163. vs.
The City of New York et al.

Edgar S. Appleby et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
164. vs.
John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of Docks, etc.

This cause was continued, per stipulation, on motion of Mr. John A. Krats in that behalf.

The Pennsylvania System Board of Adjustment of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, and Station Employees, Appellant,
629. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

Pennsylvania Railroad System et al., Appellants,
661. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry T. Hunt for the appellant in No. 629, continued by Mr. Morris Hillquit for the appellants in No. 661, by Mr. John Hampton Barnes for the appellees, and by Mr. Henry T. Hunt for the appellants in No. 629, and concluded by Mr. David Wallerstein for the appellants in No. 661.

Ray Consolidated Copper Company, Appellant,
443. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
515. vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee etc.
The United States of America et al., Petitioners,
516. vs.
Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. M. Hartfield for the respondent in No. 516.

The United States of America ex rel. Pauline Fink,

Petitioner,

vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Ellis Island.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

698.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the respondent, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to discharge the petitioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Montague, It is ordered that Charles D'Arcy Sandford, Esquire, of Petersburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William K. Miller, It is ordered that Thomas R. Gress, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Harry M. Kroon, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Josephus C. Trimble, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, It is ordered that Thomas L. Gibson, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Steinem, It is ordered that Oscar Thonander, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Sears, It is ordered that C. E. Lindley, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton, It is ordered that Alfred M. Houghton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Thomas T. Railey, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant;
The United States, intervener.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the Thirteenth Report of the Receiver, and the Auditors' Report on Accounts of the Receiver,

were received and filed.

Walter Carr, Appellant,
173. vs.
A. Alexsen, Master, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. J. C. Matthews, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stanley P. Hall et al., as Administrators etc., Appellants,
174. vs.
P. Alexander Chandler et al., etc.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

William D. Stein et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
177. vs.
Tip-Top Baking Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Charles Carroll for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Allen P. Dodd for the defendant in error.

O. H. Chrisp, Plaintiff in Error,
165. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, as Agent.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the plaintiff in error, ~~No brief was filed for the defendant in error.~~

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
168. vs.
Roy Stroud.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas T. Railey for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. George D. Moore for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, as Owner etc., Petitioner,
169. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector etc., et al., Appellants,
170. vs.
~~Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector etc., et al.~~
E. H. Callaway, as Executor etc.
E. H. Callaway, as Executor etc., Appellant,
171. vs.
Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. E. H. Callaway for the appellee in No. 170 and the appellant in No. 171, and continued by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellants in No. 170 and the appellees in No. 171.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson, It is ordered that Hugh Murphy, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Heltman, It is ordered that Clyde E. Shorey, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that William C. Kinkead, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener. 15, Orig'l.

Objections of Kirby Petroleum Company, etc., to granting time to defendant, The State of Texas, to file claim for any part of funds impounded by it with Receiver, etc., were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R.H. Ward in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener. 13, Orig'l.

The reply of T. P. Roberts and A. H. Britain to the 13th Report of the Receiver was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf.

Nicodemus B. Hurr et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Everett W. Davis and William H. Sands. 186.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Robert C. Bell for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

Buffalo Union Furnace Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. 189.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector etc., et al., Appellants, vs. E. H. Callaway, as Executor etc. 170.

E. H. Callaway, Executor etc., Appellant, vs. Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector etc., et al. 171.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellants in No. 170 and the appellees in No. 171, and concluded by Mr. E. H. Callaway for the appellee in No. 170 and the appellant in No. 171.

Cowokochee, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James A. Chapman and R. M. McFarlin. 172.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Cowokochee, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James A. Chapman and R. M. McFarlin. 172.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sanford & Brooks Company,
Appellant,
175. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellant, and by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellee.

Robert F. Mitchell et al., etc.,
Appellants,
176. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Horace S. Whitman for the appellant, continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellants.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
184. vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, It is ordered that W. A. Barnett, Esquire,of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, It is ordered that Rayburn L. Foster, Esquire, of Henryetta, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newell W. Ellison, It is ordered that Corwin Howell, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, It is ordered that A. D. Cochran, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Molyneaux Hewlett, It is ordered that John A. Hibbler, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, It is ordered that Isaac E. Ferguson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. McSwain, It is ordered that W. Turner Logan, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Theodore A. Knapp, Esquire, of Saratoga Springs, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
13, Complainant,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant;
The United States,
Intervener.

The motion of the defendant for leave to file request for royalties was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hardy Todd in that behalf.

Austin Nichols & Company,
Petitioner,
199. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.
Eug. Sanchez et al., Copartners etc.,
Petitioners,
200. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.
E. Tolibia & Company,
Petitioner,
201. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.

On motion of Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a reply brief herein on or before Monday next.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue etc.,
Petitioner,
184. vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr.

George W. Bush & Sons Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
185. vs.
William M. Maloy et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Rawls for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson and Mr. Edward H. Burke for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. George Weems Williams for the plaintiff in error.

Isom Grayson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
187. vs.
James A. Harris et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert M. Rainey for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Robert F. Blair for the defendants in error.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Appellant,
178. vs.
Anderson County, Texas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Nelson Phillips for the appellees, and submitted by Mr. S. B. Dabney and Mr. H. M. Garwood for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that W. W. Pryor, Esquire, of Holdenville, State of Oklahoma; and Allen G. Nichols, Esquire, of Okemah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly .

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. H. Kincheloe, It is ordered that Everett Jennings, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Walter F. George, Esquire, of Vienna, State of Georgia; and William B. Watkins, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. I. Salinger, It is ordered that Herbert W. Brackney, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of This Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Burch D. Huggins, Esquire, of Hillsboro, State of Ohio; and John W. Bricker, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that S. M. Bone, Esquire, of Batesville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. H. Ward, Esquire, It is ordered that John DeBerry Wheeler, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter E. Barton, It is ordered that Barton N. Grant, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton Smith, It is ordered that Roland E. Stevens, Esquire, of White River Junction, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

College Point Boat Corporation, Appellant,
121. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 13, Original.—October Term, 1924.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

[January 19, 1925.]

On consideration of the thirteenth report of the receiver herein the court makes the following orders:

1. The receiver is instructed to pay the net proceeds derived from well 156 amounting to $4,514.47, to the Kirby Petroleum Company by way of partly reimbursing it for expense incurred by it or its predecessor in drilling that well prior to the receivership—such payment to be in full discharge of all possible claims against the receivership by reason of that work and expense.

2. The receiver is instructed to pay a balance of $1,097.76 out of the net proceeds of well 156 to the Kirby Petroleum Company on its claim for expense incurred by it or its predecessor in drilling that well prior to the receivership—such payment to be in full discharge of all possible claims against the receivership by reason of that work and expense.

3. Unless within forty days from this date Tom Testerman shall accept the moneys directed to be paid to him by paragraph 11 of the order of June 9, 1924, in discharge of the claim therein described, he shall be deemed to have abandoned that claim and the moneys reserved to cover the same shall be paid over by the receiver to the Secretary of the Interior, as the representative of the United States, as a part of the net impounded funds derived from the receiver's operations within the river-bed area. The receiver is instructed to deliver or transmit forthwith to Tom Testerman a copy of this order.

4. Unless within forty days from this date the operators who presented claims for reimbursement out of the proceeds of well 139 (known as the Burke-Senator well) for the cost of drilling that well prior to the receivership shall adjust the differences be-

tween them and accept reimbursement as contemplated in paragraph 13 of the order of June 9, 1924, they are directed to show cause, within five days after the expiration of that period, why those claims should not be denied and why the moneys reserved to cover them should not be paid over to the Secretary of the Interior, as the representative of the United States, as part of the net impounded funds derived from river-bed wells. The receiver is instructed to deliver or transmit forthwith to such claimants copies of this order.

5. Pursuant to a stipulation made and presented by the conflicting claimants thereto, the receiver is instructed to pay the balance of the net royalty interest in the proceeds of wells 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 109, and 119 to A. H. Carrigan, as the joint agent and trustee of such claimants, to the end that he, according to such stipulation, may deposit such moneys in the First National Bank of Wichita Falls, Texas, there to be held to await the outcome of litigation now pending in the courts of Texas to determine the rights of such claimants in such royalty interest.

6. Pursuant to a stipulation made and presented by the conflicting claimants thereto, the receiver is instructed to pay to Rhea S. Nixon, Receiver of the Southwest Petroleum Company and trustee of certain claimants, 27/96 of the net balance of the operating interest in the proceeds of well 180 (after deducting the overriding royalty belonging to C. J. Ferguson), and also to pay to the Security National Bank of Wichita Falls, Texas, 1/6 of the said balance—the 27/96 to be held by Rhea S. Nixon, as receiver and trustee, to await the outcome of litigation now pending in the courts of Texas to determine the rights of those who are claiming interests therein, and the 1/6 to be held by the Security National Bank to await the outcome of litigation now pending in those courts to determine the rights of those who are claiming interests therein.

7. The motion of the State of Texas presented January 16, 1925, for leave to file a claim for a royalty or owner's interest in a part of the impounded funds in the receiver's custody is denied, —because, as appears from the receiver's thirteenth report before mentioned, no claim thereto was presented by that State within the period prescribed by paragraph 13 of the order of June 9, 1924, because that period has long since expired, and because to permit such a claim by the State to be presented and

entertained at this time would unreasonably prolong the receivership and would be inequitable to other claimants whose claims were seasonably presented.

8. The several conflicting claims to impounded funds derived from wells 152, 153, 154, 157, 159, 160, 162, 165, 169, 170 and 172 presented to the receiver under paragraph 18 of the order of June 9, 1924, and reported in his thirteenth report before mentioned, are referred to Joseph M. Hill, Esquire, of Fort Smith, Arkansas, as a special master, with directions that such special master take the evidence bearing on such claims and report the same to the court, together with his findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations in the premises, for the ultimate consideration and action of the court. The evidence shall be taken at Wichita Falls, Texas, and the taking thereof shall begin February 16, 1925, and shall proceed with reasonable expedition and be concluded not later than March 7, 1925. The report of the special master shall be filed with the clerk within thirty days after the evidence is taken, and shall be printed by the clerk. Claimants shall have fifteen days after the filing of the report within which to prepare, print and file exceptions to it accompanied by supporting briefs. The special master shall have authority to issue subpoenas to secure the attendance of witnesses, and also authority to employ competent stenographic and clerical assistance. Claimants shall be permitted to introduce and use in evidence any documents or other instruments appearing in the printed records in this cause without procuring new exemplifications thereof or presenting other proof of their authenticity or identification. The special master shall receive an allowance covering his actual expenses and a reasonable compensation for his service. This allowance, together with the cost of his stenographic and clerical assistance and the cost of printing his report, shall be charged against and be borne by the several claimants in such proportions and in such manner as the court hereafter may direct. Each claimant, however, shall make to the clerk an advance payment of fifty dollars towards such costs within twenty days from this date; and in default thereof the claimant shall be deemed to have abandoned his claim.

9. If, before the time fixed for taking evidence under the last paragraph, the several conflicting claimants to any particular fund make and present to the receiver a stipulation adjusting their

differences and settling their rights to such fund, or providing that the fund shall be paid over to a trustee of their selection to await an adjustment or adjudication of their claims through some medium other than this court, the receiver shall be authorized to give effect to such stipulation and to pay over the fund as therein provided, and the stipulation shall operate to withdraw the claims covered by it from the reference to the special master.

A true copy.

Test:

Clerk, Supreme Court, U. S.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee, Petitioner, vs. Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas. 369.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Cement Manufacturers' Protective Association et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 551.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, immediately after No. 342.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Forrest P. Taylor, Appellant, vs. The United States. 242.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan, Complainant, vs. The State of Wisconsin. 21, Original.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the complainant for the discharge of Honorable Conway Elder as Commissioner and for the appoint-

ment of Mrs. Margaret M. Hoit as Commissioner of this Court to take and report the proofs herein, and upon reading the resignation of said Conway Elder filed herein, and upon considering the stipulation of the parties hereto attached to said motion and filed herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the resignation of said Conway Elder be, and is hereby, accepted, and he is hereby discharged from his duty as such Commissioner, and that he immediately certify to this Court the proofs heretofore by him taken, and deliver the same to Margaret M. Hoit, hereafter mentioned, at her address of Superior, Wisconsin.

It is likewise hereby further ordered that said Conway Elder be allowed the sum of Two thousand dollars for his services as such Commissioner besides his reasonable and proper expenses incurred by him in connection with his duties as such Commissioner, one-half thereof to be paid by each of the parties hereto, within sixty days from and after the date of this order, conditioned, however, as to the payment of said expenses, that said Conway Elder make a statement thereof in duplicate rendering such statement to counsel for each of the parties hereto.

And it is further ordered that Margaret M. Hoit, Superior, Wisconsin, be, and she is hereby, appointed a Special Commissioner of this Court to take the remaining proofs to be offered by the respective parties hereto, under the rules of practice for taking proofs upon reference to a Master, and that she report such proofs so to be taken together with the proofs heretofore taken by said Commissioner Conway Elder, upon the same being by him certified and delivered to her, or upon stipulation as to the correctness of a copy thereof by counsel for the parties hereto, and that she report the deposition of Clarence M. Burton heretofore taken before a Notary Public by a stipulation of the parties hereto, and that she likewise report all testimony heretofore taken before her by stipulation of the parties hereto, with the same force and effect as though all said testimony had been regularly taken by her under an appointment by this Court as Special Commissioner, but without opinion upon said proofs or any thereof.

It is further ordered that said Commissioner Margaret M. Hoit may go from place to place and take such proofs at such convenient places and times as may seem necessary and proper in connection with the location, age and condition of the respective witnesses to be produced, and that said Commissioner Margaret M. Hoit have the power to administer oaths to the respective witnesses to be produced before her.

And it is further ordered that in the taking of proofs of either party hereto, the said Commissioner Margaret M. Hoit may require such party to advance the reasonable expenses for travelling to and returning from the designated places for taking the testimony.

The provisions in this order for the payment of money by the respective parties is temporary only, and may be adjusted by the further order of this Court upon the hearing of this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Morse, Appellant,
725. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of the appellant with respect to the printing of the record in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Frank C. Mebane,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Benjamin Catchings,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al., Appellants,
195. vs.
A. Sardell.

On consideration of the motion to re-assign this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause reassigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ellis N. Black,
Plaintiff in Error,
534. vs.
Lura W. Black.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. H. Chrisp, Plaintiff in Error,
165. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, as Agent.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicodemus B. Hurr et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
186. vs.
Everett W. Davis et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

January 19, 1925.

Cowokochee, Plaintiff in Error,

178. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court

James A. Chapman et al. of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

(This judgment first entered January 15, 1925). Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company,

Petitioner,

778. vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

The United States of America et al. of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,

Petitioners,

792. vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of

The Mountain Water Supply Company et al. Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
793. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
794. vs.
Dunbar Water Supply Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
795. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
796. vs.
The Mountain Water Supply Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
797. vs.
Westmoreland Water Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
798. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sagamore Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
799. vs.
Westmoreland Water Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry S. MacPherson, Trustee,
Petitioner,
809. vs.
Massachusetts Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Banco di Roma, Plaintiff in Error,
830. vs.
Philippine National Bank.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret W. Pearson et al.,
Appellants,
264. vs.
The United States.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. George Francis Williams and Mr. Henry C. Clark for the appellants in opposition thereto.

H. P. Trusler, Plaintiff in Error,
694. vs.
Noah Crooks et al.
the defendants in error.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for

Cheung Sum Shee et al.
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration etc.
Chang Chan et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for John D. Nagle, as Commissioner etc.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc.,
Appellants,
454. vs.
Northern States Power Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. John E. Roemer and Mr. R. M. Campbell for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the appellants in opposition thereto.

E. N. Moore et al., Petitioners,
811. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioners.

George William Mottram,
Appellant,
545. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jennings C. Wise and Mr. John S. Wise, Jr., for the appellant.

Lucy Ward Stebbins et al., Executors etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
227. vs.
Ray L. Riley, Controller of the State of California.

On motion of Mr. B. B. Pettus in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Chippewa Springs Corporation,
Petitioner,
777. vs.
Morand Brothers, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. C. Paul and Mr. B. S. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. George A. Chritton for the respondent.

Glen C. Tobias, Petitioner,
812. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter W. Stevens for the petitioner.

Martin J. Cullen et al.,
Petitioners,
813. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Chamberlin for the petitioners.

Thomas V. King, Petitioner,
814. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Chamberlin and Mr. Thomas P. White for the petitioner.

David Crowther, Petitioner,
820. vs.
Winford P. Larson.
David Crowther, Petitioner,
821. vs.
Winford P. Larson.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner.

Walbridge-Aldinger Company,
Petitioner,
823. vs.
A. J. Rudd et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles West and Mr. Everett Petry for the petitioner, and by Mr. I. L. Underwood, Mr. William F. Tucker, and Mr. Hulette F. Aby for the respondents.

Central Leather Company,
Petitioner,
835. vs.
Steamship "Goyoz", Her Engines etc., et al.,
Schmoll Fils & Company,
Petitioner,
836. vs.
Steamship "Goyoz", Her Engines etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioners, and by Mr. William A. Purrington and Mr. Frank J. McConnell for the respondents.

The St. Johns Electric Company,
Appellant,
131. vs.
The City of St. Augustine, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Johns Electric Company,
Appellant,
167. vs.
The City of St. Augustine et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capital City Water Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
202. vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

William B. Thompson,
Plaintiff in Error,
205. vs.
The City of St. Louis et al.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Proprietors of the Locks and Canals on the Merrimack River,
Plaintiff in Error,
190. vs.
Boston & Maine Railroad.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. M. Davis for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

C. V. Browne, Petitioner,
194. vs.
The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Ray Campbell for Luther M. Walter, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae. This cause was argued by Mr. Ray Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson H. Loomis for the respondent.

Austin Nichols & Company,
Petitioner,
199. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.
Eug. Sanchez et al., Copartners etc.,
Petitioners,
200. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.
E. Tolibia & Company,
Petitioner,
201. vs.
Steamship "Isla de Panay", Her Engines etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. Cates-by Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Crandall for the respondent.

Road Improvement District No. 1 of Clark County, Arkansas, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
198. vs.
Charles S. Thornton et al.

On motion of Mr. Julian C. Hammack in behalf of counsel for the appellees, this cause was continued.

Matthew Lowe, Plaintiff in Error,
203, vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, United States Marshal etc.
William P. McCarthy,
Plaintiff in Error,
204. vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, United States Marshal etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Merwin S. Bobat for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
197. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Magee, It is ordered that George R. Wallace, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan, It is ordered that John S. Hogan, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; and L. R. Pugh, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Herbert H. Thompson, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York; and Walter J. Gill, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Oswald C. Grattan, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan; and John H. Dohrman, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that Alonzo C. Owens, Esquire, of Sullivan, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wesley M. Smith, appellant,
216. vs.
W. P. McCullough et al.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
197. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. W. H. McGrann for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. C. C. Burlingham for the respondents.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants,
206. vs.
Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the appellants, continued by Mr. Mason Williams and Mr. J. D. Wheeler for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the appellants.

R. V. Mullen, Appellant,
211. vs.
J. P. Hurley et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and the appellant having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his appeal, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. H. L. Johnson, of counsel for the appellees, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Atlantic Railroad,

Appellant,

209. vs.

Georgia Public Service Commission et al., etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant, and by Mr. W. E. Watkins for the appellee.

Ohio Utilities Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

210. vs.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that Jake C. Rhyne, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas; and George W. Dodd, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. F. Twitchell, It is ordered that Ralph L. Carr, Esquire, of Antonito, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Mathbone, It is ordered that Elmer Henry Bielfeldt, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Arnold, It is ordered that David C. Arnold, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Helmus, It is ordered that Samson Selig, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Croxdale, It is ordered that Charles L. Mullen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ohio Utilities Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
210. vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. W. Bricker and Mr. B. D. Huggins for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. J. C. Martin for the plaintiff in error.

Board of Directors of Miller Levee District No. 2,
Appellant,
213. vs.
Prairie Pipe Line Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the appellant, and continued by Mr. W. H. Arnold, Jr., for the appellee. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Bartlett & Kling, Appellant,
217. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Bartlett & Kling, Appellant,
217. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, without prejudice to an application

by the appellant to the Court of Claims for an order allowing payment of $1384.74, the amount of a voucher given by the Quarter Master General to the appellant and by him returned.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald King, It is ordered that Miguel A. Munoz, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Hye P. Morehouse, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Miller Kenyon, It is ordered that William Walker Smith, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Sidney Wetmore Davidson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A.

Hostetler, It is ordered that George H. Willits, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James T. Lloyd, It is ordered that Horace Guffin, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri; James W. S. Peters, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri; and James F. Fulbright, Esquire, of Doniphan, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Hidemitsu Toyota
231. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was passed, on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in behalf of counsel.

Fort Smith Light & Traction Company. Plaintiff in Error,
220. vs.
Fagan Bourland et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. M. Campbell for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

John Clay et al., Copartners etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
221. vs.
The District Court of the Twelfth District of the State of Colorado, in and for the County of Conejos et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. A. Wells for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

John Alden Lee, Individually and as Trustee etc., Appellant,
222. vs.
Lehigh Valley Coal Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles W. Pierson for the appellees, and submitted by Mr. H. M. Hitchings and Mr. Frank Wolcott for the appellant.

Merchants Mutual Automobile Liability Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
223. vs.
Abraham B. Smart.

This cause was argued by Mr. Anthony J. Ernest for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. P. Bramhall for the defendant in error. Leave was granted Mr. J. P. Bramhall to file an additional brief herein on or before Monday next.

Sig Samuels, Plaintiff in Error,

225. vs.

J. A. McCurdy, Sheriff of DeKalb County, Georgia.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by the defendant in error on the printed record.

Sallie Canard,

Plaintiff in Error,

226. vs.

R. E. Snell, Jr., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, It is ordered that Ralph A. Smith, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Samuel M. Hawkes, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma; and Robert L. Gordon, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul C. Wagner, It is ordered that H. Robert Mays, Esquire, of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Hansen Boyden, It is ordered that Miss Shirley M. Moore, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
245. vs.
The State of Georgia, as Owner of the Western & Atlantic Railroad, et al., etc.

This cause was passed, on motion of Mr. Francis Raymond Stark in that behalf.

The State of Colorado,
Appellant,
234. vs.
Roger W. Toll, Superintendent of the Rocky Mountain National Park.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Prince Tyner,
Plaintiff in Error,
240. vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Sallie Canard, Plaintiff in Error,
226. vs.
R. E. Snell, Jr., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph C. Stone for the defendants in error.

Ben C. Davisson, Plaintiff in Error,
228. vs.
The State of New Mexico.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton J. Helmick for the defendant in error in support of the motion. No brief was filed for the plaintiff in error.

The St. Louis, Kennett & Southeastern Railroad Company,
Appellant,
229. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant, continued by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant.

Cairo, Truman & Southern Railroad Company,
Appellant,
230. vs.
The United States of America et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant, and by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Omer W. Franklin, Esquire, of Valdosta, State of Georgia; and E. K. Wilcox, Esquire, of Valdosta, State of Georgia, ~~Harold M. Marsh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia~~, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that John H. Mark, Esquire, of Wadena, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that William R. Watkins, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Everett M. Sweeley, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Jolly, It is ordered that Thurman B. Dixon, Esquire, of Bowling Green, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Williamson S. Summers, It is ordered that Lane Summers, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Simon M. Williamson, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania; Charles W. Tillett, Jr., Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina; and Dennis G. Brummett, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Herman L. Arterberry, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that Pat H. Eager, Jr., Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben J. Gibson, It is ordered that Earl W. Vincent, Esquire, of Guthrie Center, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, It is ordered that John A. McCann, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Robert M. Sohngen, Esquire, of Hamilton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that Andrew Nickas, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour, It is ordered that James M. Shields, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado.	Bill of The State of New Mexico dismissed; cross-bill of The State of Colorado sustained; and it was ordered that Commissioners be appointed to run the boundary line.
12, Orig'l.	

Mr. Justice Sanford delivered the opinion of the Court in this cause; and counsel are given leave to prepare and submit a form of decree within thirty days from this date to carry the conclusions of the opinion into effect.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of the State of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Fidelity Trust Company.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
184.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Direction der Disconto-Gesellschaft,
Appellant,
676. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, Egremont John Mills, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

January 26, 1925.

Bank fur Handel and Industrie,
Appellant,
677. vs.
United States Steel Corporation, Public Trustee, English Association of American Bond & Shareholders, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

January 26, 1925.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Margaret W. Pearson et al., Appellants,
264. vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners etc.,
Appellants,
454. vs.
Northern States Power Company.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. P. Trusler, Plaintiff in Error,
694. vs.
Noah Crooks et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.,
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

Chang Chan et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, to be heard as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the cases heretofore assigned for Tuesday, February 24th next, viz: Nos. 34, 77, 236, 342, 551, 126, 128, 135, 144, 166, 180, 182, 183, 196, 227, 238 & 259, 244, 245, 256, 281, 294, 309, 321, 330, 356, 364, 365, 371, 235 & 636, 465, 319, 48 & 49 & 50, 120, 129, 53, 583 & 584, 485 & 486, 739, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, March 2d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
767. vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 16th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
771. vs.
Abraham Weiss, Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chippewa Springs Corporation,
Petitioner,
777. vs.
Morand Brothers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. N. Moore et al., Petitioners,
811. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Glen C. Tobias, Petitioner,
812. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Martin J. Cullen et al., Petitioners,
813. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas V. King, Petitioner,
814. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Crowther, Petitioner,
820. vs.
Winfred P. Larson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Crowther, Petitioner.
821. vs.
Winford P. Larson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walbridge-Aldinger Company,
Petitioner,
823. vs.
A. J. Rudd et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Leather Company,
Petitioner,
835. vs.
Steamship "Goyaz", Her Engines etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Schmoll Fils & Company, Petitioner.
836. vs.
Steamship "Goyaz", Her Engines etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proprietors of the Locks and Canals on Merrimack River, Plaintiff in Error,
190. vs.
Boston & Maine Railroad.

In Error to the Land Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Land Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Directors of Miller Levee District No. 2, Appellant,
213. vs.
Prairie Pipe Line Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Clay et al., Copartners etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
221. vs.
The District Court of the Twelfth District of the State of Colorado, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben C. Davisson,

Plaintiff in Error,

228. vs.

The State of New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Matthew Lowe,

Plaintiff in Error,

203. vs.

Benjamin E. Dyson, U.S.Marshal.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William P. McCarthy,

Plaintiff in Error,

204. vs.

Benjamin E. Dyson, U.S.Marshal.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from Monday, February 2d next, until Monday, March 2d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

The joint request and motion to restore this case to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America ex rel. Hyman Patton, etc.,
Petitioner,
340. vs.
Robert E. Tod, as Commissioner of Immigration.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the respondent, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
827. vs.
John O. H. Pitney et al., Executors etc.;
Frank C. Ferguson, Collector,
Petitioner,
828. vs.
John O. H. Pitney et al., Executors.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Corwin Howell for the respondents.

Crew Levick Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

The joint request and motion to restore this case to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Biddle Saul in that behalf.

Domenico Dumbra et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick Milverton in that behalf.

Indian Refining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
760. vs.
John C. Taylor.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Lesh for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. James W. Noel, Mr. John Wallace Young, and Mr. Richmond Wied for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Vincent L. Knewel, Sheriff etc.,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.
Samuel Herrick for the appellant.

The motion to substitute George Boardman, present Sheriff etc., as the party appellee herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Vincent L. Knewell, Sheriff etc.,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

The motion of the State of South Dakota for leave to intervene in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick in that behalf.

No.624.
Black Rock Power & Irrigation Company, appellant, v. W. R. Adamson et al.
The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf.

D. D. Roberts et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
667. vs.
The Town of Perry, Florida, et al.

The motion for leave to amend assignment of errors and directions for printing the transcript of the record herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the plaintiffs in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Giles J. Patterson for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

New York Central Railroad Company
et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

791. vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Wolfe Bikle and Mr. Parker McCollester for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. T. R. White for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Murphy Wall Bed Company et al., Petitioners,
801. vs.
Rip Van Winkle Wall Bed Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William K. White for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. W. Boyken for the respondent.

The William M. Hardie Company, Petitioner,
817. vs.
Arthur H. Lamborn et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Williston and Mr. H. A. Hauxhurst for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis.O. Van Doren for the respondents.

T. A. Evans, petitioner,
842. vs.
The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W.Bradford for the petitioner.

Harry Dodd, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
846. vs.
Eugenia S. Westmoreland. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter S. Dillon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the respondent.

Leslie Waldeck et al., Petitioners,
850. vs.
The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ronald C. Oldham for the petitioners.

Oluf O. Gilseth, Plaintiff in Error, 248. vs. A. G. Risty et al. — This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, 249. vs. Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company. — On motion of Mr. W. P. Houghton for the defendant in error, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 253. vs. O. T. Belshe. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of Error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reading Steel Casting Company, Plaintiff in Error, 233. vs. The United States of America. — This cause was argued by Mr. Paul C. Wagner for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the defendant in error. Leave was granted Mr. Paul C. Wagner to file motion of the plaintiff in error to remand.

Esther Kaplan, Appellant, 241. vs. Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, etc. — This cause was argued by Mr. James Marshall for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellee.

Forrest P. Tayloe, Appellant, 248. vs. The United States. — This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Joseph O'Mara, Plaintiff in Error,

247. vs.

Harry C. Crampton.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Moore for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being madethe Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adam R. Gard, It is ordered that James A. Taylor, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adam R. Gard, It is ordered that John J. Dowdle, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Harry Covington, It is ordered that F. M. Shannonhouse, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseley Tiger,
Plaintiff in Error,
254. vs.
Aaron Drumright et al.

On motion of Mr. F. W. Clements in behalf of Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser, defendant in error herein, leave was granted to file a brief for the said defendant in error herein within ten days.

Henry F. Mueller et al.,
Appellants,
257. vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis W. Clements in behalf of counsel for the appellee in support of the motion; and the motion was denied. The case was continued, on motion of Mr. Henry J. Richardson in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

Fulton National Bank of Atlanta,
Petitioner,
260. vs.
I. S. Hoosier et al., Receivers of Imbrie Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Marion Smith, Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur Heyman for the respondents.

The Piqua Hosiery Company,
Appellant,
261. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

The United States, Appellant,
262. vs.
Boston Insurance Company.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellant, this cause was passed.

Joseph O'Mara,
Plaintiff in Error,
247. vs.
Harry C. Crampton.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. H. W. Moore for the plaintiff in error; and the cause was submitted by Mr. Henry Adamson for the defendant in error.

G. L. Center, Plaintiff in Error,
251. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. Richard A. Ford for the plaintiff in error.

Yadkin Railroad Co. et al.,
Petitioners,
250. vs.
Ada Sigmon, Administratrix etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. R. Prince for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. D. Maness for the respondent.

The First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa, Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
L. B. Anderson, County Auditor etc., et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Ben J. Gibson for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Karl W. Vincent for the defendants in error.

Joseley Tiger, Plaintiff in Error,
254. vs.
Aaron Drumright et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Walker, It is ordered that Pickens Neagle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and J. Austin Barnes, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Erskine, It is ordered that Harry H. Flemming, Esquire, of City of Kingston, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Wallace, It is ordered that Nelson A. Mason, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Alexander Holtzoff, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Osmond K. Fraenkel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Margaret W. Pearson et al.,
Appellants,
264. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the appellant, and continued by Mr. George F. Williams for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States, Appellant,
265. vs.
Cornell Steamboat Company.

On motion of Mr. J. Frank Staley in that behalf, leave was granted to file an additional brief for the appellant. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Walker, It is ordered that Pickens Neagle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and J. Austin Barnes, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Erskine, It is ordered that Harry H. Flemming, Esquire, of City of Kingston, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Wallace, It is ordered that Nelson A. Mason, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Alexander Holtzoff, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Osmond K. Fraenkel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Margaret W. Pearson et al.,
Appellants,
264. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the appellant, and continued by Mr. George F. Williams for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States, Appellant,
265. vs.
Cornell Steamboat Company.

On motion of Mr. J. Frank Staley in that behalf, leave was granted to file an additional brief for the appellant. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blaine F. Sturgis, It is ordered that Daniel O. Hastings, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Burnard Whitten,
Plaintiff in Error,
263. vs.
The State of Florida.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Smith Smelter Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
266. vs.
Clear Creek Oil & Gas Company.

This cause was submitted on briefs to come, by Mr. Tom M. Mehaffy, Mr. J. W. Mehaffy, and Mr. James S. Holt for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. M. Hill and Mr. H. L. Fitzhugh for the defendant in error.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
270. vs.
Southern Photo Materials Company.

This cause was passed, on motion of Mr. C. P. Moser in that behalf.

Joseley Tiger, Plaintiff in Error,
254. vs.
Aaron Drumright et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error; and the cause was submitted by Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser for the defendant in error, on briefs to be filed hereafter by leave of Court. Leave was granted Mr. Lewis C. Lawson to file a brief for the plaintiff in error herein within ten days.

Cannon Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255. vs.
Cudahy Packing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. W. Tillett, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the defendant in error.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Harriman, It is ordered that Edward M. Freeman, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that John S. Harris, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that John S. Terry, Esquire, of Terrell, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry O'B. Cooper, It is ordered that Hugo L. Black, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner, vs. L. D. Alexander et al. 274.

This cause was continued.

Dennis B. Chapin, Appellant, vs. D. A. Walker, U. S. Marshal. 275.

This cause was continued.

James H. Blundell, Executor etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William H. Wallace. 276.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Reford Bond for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. John B. Dudley for the defendant in error.

The People of the State of New York etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of the State of New York. 282.

This cause was continued.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner, vs. Davis Roberts, Jr., Trustee etc. 284.

Leave was granted to present oral argument herein without printed record, on motion of Mr. Hugh L. Black for the petitioner.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Cornell Steamboat Company. 285.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the appellee.

W. C. Singleton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Georgia. 287.

This cause was submitted by Mr. G. Y. Harrell for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky. 288.

Leave was granted to file an additional brief herein for the petitioner on or before Saturday next, on motion of Mr. Kenneth E. Stockton for the petitioner. This cause

cause was argued by Mr. Kenneth E. Stockton for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
269. vs.
Walnut Ridge-Alicia Road Improvement District

This cause was continued.

Anthony Colora, Plaintiff in Error,
271. vs.
The State of New Jersey.

This cause was submitted by Mr. E. A. Hayes for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Joseph K. Stricker for the defendant in error.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,
284. vs.
David Roberts, Jr., as Trustee etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hugo L. Black for the petitioner. No appearance was filed for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that George P. Hahn, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that Herman L. Falk, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Horan C. Knowles, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Bradley, It is ordered that Joseph Dickson, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Oscar Habenicht, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that W. H. Sadler, Jr., Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dennis B. Chapin, Appellant,
275. vs.
D. A. Walker, U. S. Marshal.

The continuance of this cause was set aside, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellee. This cause was submitted by Mr. C. M. Chambers for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee.

Harry S. Stils, Appellant,
296. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. H. E. Knight for the appellee.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,
284. vs.
Davis Roberts, Jr., as Trustee etc.

Leave was granted the respondent to file a brief herein within one week, on motion of Mr. William H. Sadler, Jr., in that behalf.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
289. vs.
Edwin W. Poe et al.

This cause was continued.

Frank L. Smith et al., Appellants,
290. vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

This cause was continued.

L. H. Myers et al., Petitioners,
291. vs.
Charles H. Anderson et al., etc.

This cause was continued.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Appellant,
292. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the appellant.

Central Union Telephone Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
293. vs.
The City of Edwardsville, Illinois.

This cause was continued.

Mae Brooks, Plaintiff in Error,
286. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joe Kirby for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error.

The First National Bank of Mobile,
Appellant,
288. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald King, It is ordered that A. W. Brown, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that James C. Davis, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abbott P. Mills, It is ordered that Hobart H. Holt, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, It is ordered that M. E. Harby, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar T. Fell, It is ordered that Edwin F. A. Morgan, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Charles S. Cutting, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and W. J. Smith, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles D. Fox, Jr., Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that George T. Cann, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barton Corneau, It is ordered that Chester W. Kingsley, Esquire, of Kingston, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald King, It is ordered that Arthur W. Beer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank D. Scott, It is ordered that John D. McPhee, Esquire, of Cheboygan, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Mary Jane Raymond, of Washington, District of Columbia; Bertha E. Pabst, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harriet M. Barbour, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Donovan, It is ordered that Louis E. Flye, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Roland J. Lehman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that John O. Davies, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Benjamin W. Morse, Appellant,
597. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Harry F. Morse, Appellant,
598. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, as Owner etc., of the Steamship "Llama",
Petitioner,
169. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified and affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of the opinion that the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.

Swiss National Insurance Company, Limited,
Appellant,
132. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice McKenna participated and concurred in the opinion prior to his resignation.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crew Levick Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

On consideration of the motion to restore this cause to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vincent L. Knewel, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motions to substitute and for leave to intervene on behalf of The State of South Dakota be, and the same are hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. D. Roberts et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
667. vs.
The Town of Perry, Florida, et al.

On consideration of the motion to amend specifications of points and directions for printing the record herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that the parts of the record designated by each of the parties shall be printed, the question of costs to await the disposition of the cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Domenico Dumbra et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Murphy Wall Bed Company et al.,
Petitioners,
801. vs.
Rip Van Winkle Bed Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The William M. Hardie Company,
Petitioner,
817. vs.
Arthur H. Lamborn et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Formerly Collector etc., Petitioner,
827. vs.
John O. H. Pitney et al., Executors etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Ferguson, Collector etc., Petitioner,
828. vs.
John O. H. Pitney et al., Executors etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. A. Evans, Petitioner,
842. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Dodd, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Petitioner,
846. vs.
Eugenia S. Westmoreland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari here-

in to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leslie Waldeck et al.,
Petitioners,
850. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Kuras, Administratrix etc.,
Petitioner,
863. vs.
The Michigan Central Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Kuras, Administratrix etc.,
Petitioner,
863. vs.
The Michigan Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Refining Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

760. vs.

John C. Taylor.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
February 2, 1925.

Joseph O'Mara,

Plaintiff in Error,

247. vs.

Harry C. Crampton.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. L. Center,

Plaintiff in Error,

251. vs.

The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Forrest P. Taylor,

242. Appellant, vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the

from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony Colora,
Plaintiff in Error,
271. vs.
The State of New Jersey.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Mobile, Alabama, Appellant,
288. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte Barker,
—, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yadkin Railroad Co

Yadkin Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
250. vs.
Ada Sigmon, Administratrix etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dennis B. Chapin, Appellant,
275. vs.
D. A. Walker, United States Marshal for the Western District of Texas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 16th next, in order that George Wharton Pepper, Esquire, at the invitation of the Court, may address an argument to it as amicus curiae, on behalf of the appellant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant,
39. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
244. vs.
DeWitt T. Law.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al.,
Appellants,
509. vs.
William F. Waldow, as Sheriff of Erie County, New York, et al.

The joint request to restore this case to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The Oliver American Trading Company,
Petitioner,
824. vs.
The Government of the United States of Mexico et al.

The suggestion of the Secretary of State was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
861. vs.
Maurice P. Davidson, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted by Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, Mr. E. M. Allison, Jr., and Mr. Henry M. Ward for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. John S. Sheppard, Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts, and Mr. Alvin C. Cass for the respondent.

Joseph L. Lackner, Administrator de bonis non with the will annexed of the Estate of Frederic C. Wier, deceased,
Petitioner,
834. vs.
Merritt Starr, Surviving Partner of the Firm of Miller & Starr.

F. McPherson for the petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Cutting, Mr. Charles H. Aldrich, and Mr. Donald

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.,
Petitioners,
420. vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

Benjamin Guinness et al.,
Petitioners,
421. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. Carter Hall in that behalf.

Thomas Agnello et al.,
Petitioners,
45. vs.
The United States of America.

The joint request to restore this case to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Swagar Sherley in that behalf.

Robeson Process Company,
Petitioner,
845. vs.
Jacob S. Robeson et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Houghton, Mr. Julius M. Mayer, and Mr. F. P. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clair W. Fairbank and Mr. Irving M. Obreight for the respondents.

Ex parte In the matter of Ivan Olavadanovic,
—. Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf.

Perry Browning et al., Appellants, 865. vs. E. M. Hooper et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, 249. vs. Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

The joint request to restore this case to the call, pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in that behalf.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Inc., Petitioner, 824. vs. The Government of the United States of Mexico et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Greacen and Mr. Alfred Hayes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jerome S. Hess and Mr. Harold H. Kigar for the respondents.

William J. Head, Petitioner, 831. vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Harper and Mr. Eugene Underwood, Jr., for the petitioner.

Clyde Hunter, Petitioner, 843. vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clair McTurnan, Mr. William R. Higgins, Mr. Charles M. McCabe, and Mr. Merrill Moores for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Joseph P. Margolin, Petitioner, 858. vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Kirsh for the petitioner.

Mary H. Selvage, Petitioner,
860. vs.
Brockenbrough Lamb, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioner, and by Mr. James E. Cannon for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 2d next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that Valentine Worthington, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, It is ordered that John S. Sheffard, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton Watkins, It is ordered that John C. Veatch, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton Watkins, It is ordered that Hall S. Lusk, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl C. Michener, It is ordered that Ward H. Peck, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Hearns, It is ordered that R. D. Colmery, Esquire, of Mt. Gilead, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, Jr., It is ordered that Joseph Kraemer, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, Jr., It is ordered that Joseph Siegler, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, It is ordered that Frederick D. Anderson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, It is ordered that Eugene P. Ledbetter, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Emily Dashiell, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Arnold, It is ordered that Charles L. Richards, Esquire, of Reno, State

of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Katharine Lloyd Campbell, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, andshe was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund H. Parry, It is ordered that William C. McCoy, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, It is ordered that William Donald Campbell, Esquire, of Forsyth, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, It is ordered that William Louis Boatright, Esquire, of Golden, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer, It is ordered that Henry H. Asher, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, It is ordered that Preston Rucko Calvert, Esquire, of Pawnee, State Of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Victor Levine, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Carsway, It is ordered that Carl L. Hunter, Esquire, of Piggott, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that Lois Dale, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that Frank L. Guerena, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that Charles P. Cutten, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Benton, It is ordered that Carl I. Wheat, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward B. Dunford, It is ordered that Arthur W. Hill, Esquire, of Eureka, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall, It is ordered that Thomas W. Y. Clark, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, It is ordered that George W. Des Jardins, Esquire, of Lapeer,

State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Moody, It is ordered that Fred H. Salway, Esquire, of Portland, Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Robert E. Acorn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred C. Geiger, It is ordered that Olive Evelyn Geiger, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe R. Koch, It is ordered that Charles L. Guerin, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Moody, It is ordered that O. A. Neal, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that Algernon Crofton, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Clarence J. McLeod, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the appointment of Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone to be an Associate Justice of this Court. Mr. Stone is present, and the Clerk will read the commission. The Clerk read the commission as follows:

Calvin Coolidge,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

Know ye, that, reposing special trust and confidence in the wisdom, uprightness, and learning of Harlan Fiske Stone, of New York, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges, and emoluments to be the same of right appertaining unto him, the said Harlan Fiske Stone, during his good behavior.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent, and the Seal of the Department of Justice hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 5th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-ninth.

Calvin Coolidge.

By the President:

James M. Beck,

Acting Attorney General.

The oath of office was administered by the Chief Justice, and Mr. Justice Stone was escorted by the Marshal to his seat on the Bench.

The United States of America and Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 515. vs. Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Abraham Finkelstein, Israel Finkelstein, et al., etc.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America and Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

516. vs.

Alfred C. Coxe, Jr., Receiver of Jones and Baker, Alleged Bankrupts.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

William T. Price and Ora Price,

Plaintiffs in Error,

14. vs.

Magnolia Petroleum Company et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Margaret W. Pearson and J. R. Pearson, Her Husband,

Appellants,

264. vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The City of Newark, The City of Jersey City, and The State of New Jersey,
Appellants,
351. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey and The Port of New York Authority.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, American Surety Company of New York, Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, et al.,
Appellants,
338. vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation, Henry G. Atha, James O'Grady, et al.,etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further pro-

ceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Appellant,
29. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

(On Rehearing).

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Appellant,
83. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
168. vs. On writ of certiorari to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.
Roy Stroud.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, Paulina Carolina, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
187. vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, James H. Kennedy, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, Paulina Carolina, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
187. vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, James H. Kennedy, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Ohio Utilities Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
210. vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, deceased, Petitioner,
275. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

James H. Blundell, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Patsy Paff, deceased, Juanita Blundell, Oleta Blundell, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
276. vs.
William R. Wallace.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,
345. vs.
M. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works of the State of Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

George W. Bush & Sons Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
185. vs.
William M. Maloy, J. Frank Harper, and Ezra B. Whitman, constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. B. Smyth, W. A. Smyth, and Uvalde Rock Asphalt Company,
Appellants,
206. vs.
Asphalt Belt Railway Company and A. H. Ponder, Receiver etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to proceed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Fort Smith Light & Traction Company, Plaintiff in Error,
220. vs.
Fagan Bourland, M. J. Miller, and M. F. Smith, City Commissioners of the City of Fort Smith, Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Cannon Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255. vs.
Cudahy Packing Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Henry Merritt, Appellant,
159. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Robert F. Mitchell, George H. Mitchell, Copartners Trading as R.F. and G.H.Mitchell,
Appellants,
176. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

St. Louis, Kennett & Southeastern Railroad Company, Appellant,
229. vs.
The United States of America and James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Cairo, Truman & Southern Railroad Company, Appellant,
230. vs.
The United States of America and James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

C. V. Browne, Petitioner,
194. vs.
The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr.Justice McReynolds.

Austin Nichols & Company,
Petitioner,
199. vs.
Steamship Isla de Panay, Her Engines etc., Compania Trasatlantica.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Eug. Sanchez and Jose Gilde Sagredo, Copartners, Trading as E. Sanchez & Company,
Petitioner,
200. vs.
Steamship Isla de Panay, Her Engines etc., Companis Trasatlantica.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Taft.
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

E. Tolibia & Company,
Petitioner,
201. vs.
Steamship Isla de Panay, Her Engines etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Fulton National Bank of Atlanta,

Petitioner,

260. vs.

I. S. Hozier and Theodore G. Smith, John B. Johnston and Edward Gilmore, as Receivers of Imbrie & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, the costs in all the courts to be taxed against the intervener, the respondent here; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States, Appellant,

265. vs.

Cornell Steamboat Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,

422. vs.

A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Edmund Ludwig Ring, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the

same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent of the President, operating Philadelphia & Reading Railway,
Plaintiff in Error,
709. vs.
George B. Newton Coal Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent of the President, operating Philadelphia & Reading Railway,
Plaintiff in Error,
710. vs.
George B. Newton Coal Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
444. vs.
The Archibald McNeil & Sons Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The A. B. Small Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
101. vs.
The American Sugar Refining Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The A. B. Small Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
100. vs.
Lamborn & Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America
47. vs.
Steamship "Coamo", Her Engines etc., New York & Porto Rico Steamship Company, Claimant.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
75. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William D. Stein, Frank G. Hall, and Gerda Stein, Partners doing business under the firm name of Stein, Hall & Company, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
177. vs.
Tip-Top Baking Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Esther Kaplan, Appellant,

241. vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Ellis Island, Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fort Smith Spelter Company,

Plaintiff in Error.

266. vs.

Clear Creek Oil & Gas Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James Shewan & Sons, Appellant,

42. vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that the costs of this appeal be, and the same are hereby, assessed against The United States, with directions to the District Court to assess also the costs of the suit in that Court and interest as that Court shall order it in accordance with the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Philip Grossman,

——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that the petitioner be discharged.

William Mahmeh, Appellant,

157. vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merchants Mutual Automobile Liability Insurance Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

223. vs.

Abram B. Smart.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York.

March 2, 1925.

George Carroll and John Kiro,

Plaintiffs in Error,

15. vs.

The United States.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice McKenna, before his retirement, concurred in the opinion of this Court.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America ex rel. Logan Rives. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

272.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to overrule the demurrer to the answer, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

401.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to overrule the demurrer to the answer, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sig Samuels, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. A. McCurdy, Sheriff of Dekalb County, Georgia. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

225.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Butler.

Pennsylvania Railroad System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, Executive Council of Pennsylvania System and Allied Lines Federation No. 90, et al.,
Appellants,
661. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Samuel Rea, W.W.Atterbury, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania System Board of Adjustment of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees,
Appellant,
629. vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Samuel Rea, W. W. Atterbury, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

341. vs.

Lucia Naponiello et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corby Estate,

Plaintiff in Error,

562. vs.

The City of St. Joseph.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
March 2, 1925.

Sallie Canard,

Plaintiff in Error,

226. vs.

R. E. Snell, Jr., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseley Tiger, Plaintiff in Error,

254. vs.

Aaron Drumright et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel

W. C. Singleton, Plaintiff in Error,
267. vs.
The State of Georgia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Crowson, Plaintiff in Error,
590. vs.
Michael Cody et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George William Mottram, Appellant,
545. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Ivan —, Original.
Glavadanovic, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant,
39. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al., Appellants,
509. vs.
William F. Waldow, Sheriff etc., et al.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Agnello et al., Petitioners,
45. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
249. vs.
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

~~Louisville & Nashville Railroad~~

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the

cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Petitioners,
420. vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

Benjamin Guinness et al., Petitioners,
421. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Perry Browning et al., Appellants,
865. vs.
E. M. Hooper et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
663. vs.
The A. F. Thompson Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Harold Taylor, Trustee under the Will of Mary E. Erskine, deceased, et al., Petitioners,

720. vs.

Harry W. Voss, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration ~~whereof~~ of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent, Petitioner,

786. vs.

E. H. Pringle, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc., Petitioner,

787. vs.

E. H. Pringle, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph P. Margolin, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 858. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. New York & Pennsylvania Company. 791. It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner, vs. Reuben M. Barber et al. 780. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Petitioner, vs. The Government of the United States of Mexico et al. 824. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Read, Petitioner,
831. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde Hunter, Petitioner,
843. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robeson Process Company,
Petitioner,
845. vs.
Jacob S. Robeson et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary H. Selvage, Petitioner,
860. vs.
Brockenbrough Lamb, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
861. vs.
Maurice P. Davidson, Trustee etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee, Petitioner,
389. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

On consideration of the motion to amend the judgment heretofore entered in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the direction in the opinion heretofore filed to remand the cause to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, be, and the same is hereby, changed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit for further proceedings.

It is further ordered that the mandate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, amended accordingly.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Fort Worth, Texas, Appellant,
487. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the opinion heretofore filed be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking from the sixth line the word "appellant", and from the seventh line the words "in the meantime, having", and by inserting in the seventh line between the word "note", and the word "appellant", the words "and, thereafter".

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
268. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The Clerk is directed to notify the Attorney General of the State of Kentucky of the restoration of this cause to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hidemitsu Toyota
231. vs.
The United States of America.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States, Appellant,
262. vs.
Boston Insurance Company.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Harry B. Stilz, Appellant,
296. vs.
The United States.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
330. vs.
Herbert H. McGovern.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
847. vs.
The Baltimore Post.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

George D. Provost et al., Copartners etc.,
Appellants,
867. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

The death of Frank S. Myers, the appellant herein, was suggested, and it was ordered that Lois P. Myers, Administratrix of the Estate of Frank S. Myers, deceased, be substituted as the party appellant herein.

James D. Barton, Petitioner,
840. vs.
Leyte Asphalt & Mineral Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Augustus T. Seymour for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Walsh for the respondent.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
12, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The petition for modification of the opinion, and the proposed form of decree herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Jones in behalf of Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the complainant.

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant,
216. vs.
W. P. McCullough et al.

The death of Paul A. Ewert, one of the appellees herein, was suggested, and the motion to revive in the name of Sidney T. Ewert as Executrix of Paul A. Ewert, deceased, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Hastings in behalf of Mr. A. Scott Thompson for the appellant.

Axel W. Hallenborg,
Plaintiff in Error,
705. vs.
Green Consolidated Copper Company et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Brennan for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers' Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

Leave was granted to file a brief of Mr. Herbert Pope as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of Nicholas J. Curtis,
Orig'l. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nicholas J. Curtis, pro se.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Appellant,
892. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
289. vs.
Edwin W. Poe et al.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hartwell Cabell and Mr. Daniel O. Hastings for the appellant, and by Mr. Stuart S. Janney and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the appellees.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
869. vs.
The Insular Collector of Customs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. W. Brown for the respondent.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

Leave was granted to file a brief of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, herein, as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in that behalf.

Frank Moore, President of the Odd Lot Cotton Exchange of New York,
Appellant,
721. vs.
The New York Cotton Exchange et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Coleman for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the appellees in opposition thereto.

J. W. Patterson, Doing Business as J. W. Patterson Commission Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
764. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, intervener.

The Report of the Commissioners as to the time employed and expenses incurred in the survey, was received and filed, on motion of Mr. Arthur D. Kidder in behalf of the Commissioners.

Ex parte In the matter of A. A. Sanders,
---, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener.

The motion of the Supreme Oil Company et al. to require the Receiver to pay certain sums of money was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. K. C. Barkley.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
—, vs.
Orig'l
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion of National Petroleum & Refining Company to recharge expenses of Well No. 169 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. K. C. Barkley in that behalf.

Charles E. Wells, Appellant,
144. vs.
Patrick H. Bodkin et al.

The death of Charles E. Wells was suggested, and Susie Wells, Administratrix of the Estate of Charles E. Wells, deceased, was ordered substituted as the party appellant herein, on motion of Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of counsel in that behalf.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
12, vs.
Orig'l.
The State of Colorado.

The proposed form of decree on behalf of The State of Colorado was submitted by Mr. William L. Boatright in that behalf.

Manuel J. Jacobs, Petitioner,
829. vs.
Myra F. Jacobs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carlos P. Griffin and Mr. Eugene C. Brown for the petitioner.

John Mullen et al., Petitioners,
837. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Tinkham for the petitioner.

Pacific American Fisheries, Petitioner,
844. vs.
Territory of Alaska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. S. McCord,

Mr. Warren Gregory, and Mr. R. E. Robertson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Rustgard for the respondent.

Minnie M. Williams, etc., Executrix etc., et al., Petitioners, 854. vs. Freeman B. Christopher. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Pugh and Mr. L. P. Pugh for the petitioners, and by Mr. James M. Linton for the respondent.

William A. Greene, Trustee etc., Petitioner, 855. vs. J. L. Booth, Trustee etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter B. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the respondents.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner, 859. vs. Catherine Lind, Administratrix. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Hoadly, Mr. Judson Harmon, and Mr. Edward Colston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M. Ballard for the respondent.

J. W. Patt, Petitioner, 862. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bryan H. Tivnen and Mr. Michael M. Doyle for the petitioner.

Oscar Thornton et al., Petitioners, 864. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. K. Wilcox and Mr. John W. Bennett for the petitioner.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
866. vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. N. Van Doren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Julius J. Patek for the respondents.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, Petitioner,
868. vs.
Mary Ambrose, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Miller and Mr. Silas H. Strawn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mont T. Prewitt for the respondent.

Ella Foley, Administratrix etc., Petitioner,
871. vs.
New York, Ontario & Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner.

Panama Railroad Company, Petitioner,
872. vs.
Agapito Vasquez, Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick R. Graves for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
876. vs.
Odell Mills, as Administrator.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston for the petitioner.

Howard S. Mellot, Petitioner,
877. vs.
Charles H. Mabee et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald F. Melhorn for the petitioner.

Clyde A. Davis, Trustee,
Petitioner,
878. vs.
Charles R. Mabee et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George White for the petitioner.

Terrell M. Ragan, Trustee,
Petitioner,
880. vs.
Allan Forbes, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob J. Kaplan for the petitioner, and by Mr. William D. Turner for the respondent.

France and Canada Steamship Corporation, as Owner etc.,
Petitioner,
882. vs.
Midland Linseed Products Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter and Mr. Charles D. Francis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herman S. Hertwig for the respondent.

George L. Moore et al.,
Petitioners,
883. vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorarari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bryan H. Tivnen and Mr. Michael M. Doyle for the petitioners.

Traylor Engineering & Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
884. vs.
Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank B. Fox, Henry N. Paul, and Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads etc., Petitioner,
885. vs.
Frank Griffith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Ball, Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. W. R. Bleakmore, and Mr. A. T. Boys for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred E. Suits for the respondents.

Louis Brownstein et al., Petitioners,
886. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald Palmer for the petitioners.

Alden W. Bohn, Petitioner,
889. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the ~~United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Secon~~ Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. W. Root and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the respondent.

Christina M. Hoeffner, Administratrix etc., Petitioner,
890. vs.
National Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. S. Mauk for the petitioner.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
891. vs.
Edith F. Coogan, Special Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the ~~United States Circuit Court of Appeal~~ Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Root and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lyle Pettijohn for the respondent.

C. W. Johnson, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
895. vs.
Sallie B. Duncan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emile Steinfeld for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General, Appellant,
897. vs.
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the appellant in support of the petition.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
898. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer W. Davis and Mr. John G. Drennan for the petitioner.

Samuel Reich, Trustee, Petitioner,
900. vs.
Kenneth W. McNiel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Comley for the petitioner.

Edward Smale, Jr., et al., Petitioners,
917. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Jennings for the petitioner.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company of Hartford, Petitioner,
922. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the petitioner.

Jaybird Mining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
929. vs.
Joe Weir, as County Treasurer of Ottawa County, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Scott Thompson, Mr. A. C. Wallace, Mr. Vern E. Thompson, ~~Mr. A. C. Wallace,~~ and Mr. Ray McNaughton for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Morris M. Becher, Petitioner,
941. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioner.

Morray H. Birnbaum, Petitioner,
942. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otho S. Bowling for the petitioner.

A. R. McCullough et al., Copartners etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
245. vs.
Olaf Anton Janson.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. H. Myers et al., Petitioners,
291. vs.
Charles H. Anderson et al., Copartners etc., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered

and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
485. vs.
Richard E. Collins et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
486. vs.
Richard E. Collins et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winchester Cooley,
Plaintiff in Error,
788. vs.
C. C. Ozment, Receiver.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. M. Wingo, Plaintiff in Error,
789. vs.
C. C. Ozment, Receiver.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Banco di Roma, Plaintiff in Error,
830. vs.
The Philippine National Bank.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Loughran for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Continental Casualty Company, etc., et al., Petitioners,
879. vs.
Alfred W. Agee, Administrator etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
888. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, as to plaintiffs in error Benjamin Cody and Percy H. Kearnes, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as to plaintiffs in error Benjamin Cody and Percy H. Kearnes.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Oliver, as Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
180. vs.
The United States of America et al. the respondents.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Louis V. Crowley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Merrill E. Otis for

Frank Durand et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
309. vs.
The First State Bank of Philipsburg.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Maury for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. R. E. McHugh and Mr. Milton S. Gunn for the defendant in error.

North Pacific Steamship Company, Plaintiff in Error,
364. vs.
William T. Soley.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Ernest Clewe for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry Heidelberg and Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the defendant in error.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
34. vs.
Farmers' Grain Company of Embden et al.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the appellants, and continued by Mr. David F. Simpson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that August H. Andresen, Esquire, of Red Wing, State of Minnesota; Allen J. Furlow, Esquire, of Rochester, State of Minnesota; Godfrey G. Goodwin, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Minnesota; and Samuel Norman Nichols, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court ~~in this Court~~ in this behalf by Mr. Hiram K. Evans, It is ordered that F. Dickinson Letts, Esquire, of Davenport, State of Iowa; Everett Kent, Esquire, of Bangor, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, It is ordered that Charles O'Conner, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Wayne Francis Lee, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio; and LeRoy Albert Foot, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Harriet Belvel Evans, It is ordered that Vincent Starzinger, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Andrew Veleber, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; H. S. Roberts, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas; and Edwin Brown, Esquire, of Troy, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that Frederic M. Sackett, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that John Blaine Gilbreath, Esquire, of Ada, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Graham, It is ordered that Nathan L. Strong, Esquire, of Brookville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that James O. Campbell, Esquire, of Butler, State of Pennsylvania; Harry A. Estep, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania; Samuel H. Gardner, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania; and Harry J. Thomas, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Graham, It is ordered that Nathan D. Perlman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hall S. Lusk, It is ordered that J. P. Kavanaugh, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Chester J. Morse, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Royal H. Weller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Bramhall, It is ordered that Edward J. McCrossin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, It is ordered that W. Halverson Parr, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Cobb, It is ordered that C. H. Calloway, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Laskey, It is ordered that George B. Neville, Esquire, of Meridian, State

of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that LeRoy Albert Foot, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Clinton H. Bell, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that George A. Barr, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois; and Richard J. Barr, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois; ~~land~~, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Prince Tyner, Plaintiff in Error,
240. vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Whiteley in that behalf.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
34. vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Embden et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. David F. Simpson for the appellees.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

Cement Manufacturers Protective Association et al., Appellants,
551. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the appellants, and by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, 11:30 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess to attend the Inauguration of the President of the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremiah E. O'Connell, It is ordered that John A. Bennett, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island; and Edward J. Noons, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, It is ordered that Benton S. Oppenheimer, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A.Mitchell Palmer, It is ordered that Maximilian K. Margolis, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel T. O'Connell, It is ordered that Henry P. Fielding, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrieus A. Jones, It is ordered that Lytton R. Taylor, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas; and Sam G. Bratton, Esquire, of Santa Fe, New Mexico, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Parker, It is ordered that Leland Stanford, Esquire, of Stoneville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred O. Erickson, It is ordered that Robert Hamilton Ebeile, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred O. Erickson, It is ordered that Oscar E. Carlstrom, Esquire, of Aledo, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred O. Erickson, It is ordered that Harry H. Talcott, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. L. Allen, It is ordered that Frank P. Weaver, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Vincent P. Pace, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that George A. Berry, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, It is ordered that Hugh E. McElroy, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles E. Wells, Appellant,
144. vs.
Patrick H. Bodkin et al.

The death of Patrick H. Bodkin was suggested; and Jesse Bodkin and Arabella Bodkin, heirs-at-law of Patrick H. Bodkin, deceased, were ordered substituted as parties appellees herein, on motion of Mr. Patrick H. Loughran in that behalf.

Cement Manufacturers Protective Association et al., Appellants,
551. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee.

A. L. May, Trustee etc.,
Petitioner,
126. vs.
J. M. Henderson, Jr., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. A. Jacobs for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. DeLigne for the respondents.

Perry S. Olson et al., Doing Business etc. as Olson Brothers, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
128. vs.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. O. A. Neal for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Homer H. Cooper, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Barnard, It is ordered that George J. Coleman, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that Albert A. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Francis Reed, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneysand Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund C. Fletcher, It is ordered that George W. Yancey, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Semmes, It is ordered that Allen Evarts Foster, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Zabel, It is ordered that John F. Garner, Esquire, of Quincy, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Ramsey, It is ordered that Edgar T. Noble, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Ramsey, It is ordered that John Ladner, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Perry S. Olson et al., Doing Business etc., as Olson Bros.,etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
128. vs.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. O. A. Neal for the plaintiffsin error, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. O. A. Neal for the plaintiffs in error.

Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District, Appellant,
135. vs.
J. B. Bond, Project Manager, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. E. McElroy for the appellant, continued by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the appellee J. B. Bond, by Mr. J. B. Eldridge for the appellee Payette-Boise Water Users Association, Limited, and concluded by Mr. Will R. King for the appellant.

Susie Wells, Administratrix of Charles E. Wells, deceased, Appellant,
144. vs.
Jesse Bodkin and Arabella Bodkin, Heirs-at-Law of Patrick H. Bodkin, deceased, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Patrick H. Laughran for the appellees, and submitted by Mrs. Susie Wells, Administrix, pro se.

W. A. Cockrill and S. Idada,
Plaintiffs in Error,
182. vs.
The People of the State of California.

This cause was argued by Mr. Algernon Crofton for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. F. L. Guerena for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Albert Baldwin, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, It is ordered that George A. Schneider, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that Joseph D. Peeler, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that George E. Holmes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Randolph E. Paul, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker

Willebrandt, It is ordered that Edith Leval Marshall, ~~Esquire,~~ of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Vance, Jr., It is ordered that Daniel Waters, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August H. Andreson, It is ordered that David L. Grannis, Esquire, of South St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, It is ordered that Sidney V. Lowell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Charles H. Smith, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion E. Rhodes, It is ordered that Witt H. Thompson, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Max M. Horowitz, Appellant,

74. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Sanford & Brooks Company,

Appellant,

175. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. L. Lancaster and Charles L. Wallace, Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway,
Plaintiffs in Error,
148. vs.
B. W. McCarty, J. T. McCarty, Guy McCarty, et al., etc.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rae Brooks,
Plaintiff in Error,
286. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.-

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barclay & Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
547. vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Hidemitsu Toyota
231. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 16th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
262. vs.
Boston Insurance Company.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
March 9, 1925.

Harry B. Stilz, Appellant,
296. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
289. vs.
Edwin W. Poe et al.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prince Tyner, Plaintiff in Error,
240. vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
847. vs.
The Baltimore and

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court

that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Provost et al., Copartners etc., Appellants,
867. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Patterson, Doing Business as J. W. Patterson Commission Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
764. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Moore, President of the Odd-Lot Cotton Exchange of New York, Appellant,
781. vs.
The New York Cotton Exchange et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
12, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for modification of the opinion in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Nicholas J. Curtis,

——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,

Appellant,

292. vs.

The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Axel W. Hallenborg,

Plaintiff in Error,

705. vs.

Green Consolidated Copper Company et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Durand et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

309. vs.

First State Bank of Philipsburg.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North Pacific Steamship Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
864. vs.
William T. Soley.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of A. A. Sanders, Petitioner.
—,Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific American Fisheries,
Petitioner,
844. vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on fileas an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oscar Thornton et al.,
Petitioners,
864. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
872. vs.
Agapito Vasquez, as Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
876. vs.
Odell Mills, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ira S. Mills, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Mullen et al., Petitioners,
837. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Mullen et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

837.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Greene, as Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Petitioner, vs. J. L. Booth, as Trustee in Bankruptcy etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

855.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Patt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

862.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Mary Ambrose, Administratrix etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

868.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

gument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
869. vs.
The Insular Collector of Customs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Howard S. Mellott, Petitioner,
877. vs.
Charles R. Mabee et al., Trustees in Bankruptcy etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde A. Davis, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Petitioner,
878. vs.
Charles R. Mabee et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Terrell M. Ragan, Trustee,
Petitioner,
880. vs.
Allan Forbes, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

France and Canada Steamship Corporation, as Owner of the Schooner "Oakley G. Curtis", etc.,
Petitioner,
882. vs.
Midland Linseed Products Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George L. Moore et al.,
Petitioners,
883. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Traylor Engineering and Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
884. vs.
Worthington Pump and Machinery Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Brownstein et al.,
Petitioners,
886. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alden W. Bohm, Petitioner,
889. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christina M. Hoeffner, as Administratrix etc.,
Petitioner,
890. vs.
National Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Johnson & Company, Bankrupts, Petitioner, vs. Sallie B. Duncan. 895. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Reich, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Petitioner, vs. Kenneth W. McNeil. 900. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Swift & Company. 920. — The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings, and to embrace in the transcript of record certain motions made in the Court of Claims prior to the entry of final judgment, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf; and the reply thereto was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Carroll Todd in that behalf.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Ernest J. Goneau. 413. — The motion to dismiss or transfer to the summary docket in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Hudson in behalf of Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner and Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

~~Per Mr. Chief Justi~~

Henderson Water Company,
Appellant,
851. vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina et al.

The motion to advance and transfer to the summary docket in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Bridgers for the appellant, and by Mr. B. H. Perry for the appellee.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
839. vs.
Jackson & Eastern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Robert H. Thompson, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. A. S. Boreman, and Mr. S. L. McLaurin for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Marcellus Green for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Petitioner,
892. vs.
Loveland and Hinyan and Fremont Canning Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Shields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clare J. Hall and Mr. Joseph R. Gillard for the respondent.

P. W. Ewing, Petitioner,
904. vs.
E. B. Shauver et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Semmes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry William Hart for the respondents.

The Butterick Company et al.,
Petitioners,
906. vs.
The Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Noble, Mr. Julius M. Mayer, Mr. Scott Scammell, and Mr. Hartwell P. Heath for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. H. Fuller for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota. 919.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. W. Dynes, Mr. J. H. Davis, and Mr. H. H. Field for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Raymond L. Dillman for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

William Stevens, Petitioner, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company. 928.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Brengle and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. Homer W. Davis, and Mr. S. G. Bristow for the respondent.

Tan Pho et al., Petitioners, vs. Faustino Lichauco, as Guardian ad litem of the minors Luis and Julita Lichauco et al. 945.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick C. Fisher and Mr. Clyde A. DeWitt for the petitioners.

Oluf O. Gilseth, Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. G. Risty et al. 248.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Porter for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. O. Bailey for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

T. Frank Smith, Petitioner, vs. Sam L. Gross, U. S. Marshal for the Northern District of Texas. 924.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

L. J. Robling, Petitioner,

925. vs.

Sam L. Gross, U. S. Marshal for the Northern District of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appealsfor the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. O. Linder, Petitioner,

183. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. George Turner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Bacon & Matheson Forge Company, et al.,
Appellants,

196. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. William H. Gorham and Mr. James Kiefer for the appellants.

Lucy Ward Stebbins et al., Executrix and Executor etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

227. vs.

Ray L. Riley, Controller of the State of California.

This cause was argued by Mr. Carey Van Fleet for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. R. W. Smith for the defendant in error.

A. Brambini and Isadore Maffia,
Plaintiffs in Error,

238. vs.

The United States of America et al.

A. Brambini and Isadore Maffia,
Plaintiffs in Error,

259. vs.

The Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Robert Ash for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Mid-Northern Oil Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

256. vs.

J. W. Walker, as Treasurer of the State of Montana, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. D. Anderson for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

County of Tuolumne et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error.

281. vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Grant for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Barnard, It is ordered that James H. Van Horn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Ralph O. Stauber, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan J. Doyle, It is ordered that Edward J. Hennessy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan J. Doyle, It is ordered that Thomas D. Nash, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Michael J. Ahern, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
~~The United States, Intervener.~~

ORDER. It is ordered that the order heretofore made in this cause, dated December 4, 1924, appointing Charles Warren, Esquire, as Special Master, be amended by adding the following:

The Master may in his discretion receive a brief of an amicus curiae whom the Court has already permitted to file a brief in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Tuolumne et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
281. vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Grant for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. A. P. Cutten and Mr. Carl I. Wheat for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William Grant for the plaintiff in error.

Alaska Steamship Company
294. vs.
Bernard McHugh.

This cause was submitted by Mr. William H. Bogle and Mr. R. E. Robertson for Alaska Steamship Company, and by Mr. James Wickersham for Bernard McHugh.

E. E. McCalla Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
321. vs.
The People of the State of California.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. L. Guerena for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the plaintiff in error.

Cattina Sala, Plaintiff in Error,
356. vs.
A. Crane et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. T. Vogelsang in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error in support of the motion. This cause was submitted by Mr. O. C. Moore, Mr. Cyrus Happy and Mr. Dale D. Drain for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John P. Gray for the defendants in error.

Industrial Association of San Francisco, California, et al., Appellants,
365. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. H. Phlager for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the appellee.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Department of Public Works of Washington et al.

371.

The suggestion of the resignation of H. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works of the State of Washington, and the motion to substitute Walter B. Whitcomb, his successor in office, as a party defendant in error herein, was submitted by Mr. C. W. Bunn in that behalf. Three hours and five minutes was allowed for the argument of this cause, on motion of Mr. C. W. Bunn in that behalf. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Cabell Bruce, It is ordered that Ashby Tolson, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland; and Theodore H. Schrieber, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Levi Ginsburg, Esquire, of Elmira, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred T. Davison, It is ordered that Addison B. Scoville, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paca Oberlin, It is ordered that Arthur Van Meter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Ralph R. Molster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court,

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Veatch, It is ordered that William A. Williams, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Colorado, Appellant,
234. vs.
Roger W. Toll, Superintendent of the Rocky Mountain National Park.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Barbour in that behalf.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
371. vs.
The Department of Public Works of the State of Washington et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the plaintiffs in error; by Mr. F. M. Dudley for the plaintiffs in error Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company; by Mr. Raymond W. Clifford for the defendants in error; and by Mr. Scott C. Henderson for the defendants in error; and concluded by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the plaintiffs in error.

John F. Steele, Appellant,
235. vs.
The United States of America.
John F. Steele, Plaintiff in Error,
636. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar for the appellant and plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al., Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the appellants, and continued by Mr. M. M. Fertig for the appellants and by Mr. A. T. Davison for the appellee.

Proclamation being madethe Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, It is ordered that Alex. U. Puckitt, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Robert M. Golding, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, It is ordered that Paul F. Myers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Butterworth-Judson Corporation et al.

338.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
75. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

The motion for the mandate in this cause was postponed until service of notice on opposing counsel.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.
Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

Leave was granted to file a brief of William A. Williams herein as amicus curiae.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
236. vs.
The United States.

Leave was granted to file a brief of James Byrne and Arthur A. Ballentine herein as amici curiae, on motion of Mr. James Byrne in that behalf.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al., Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. T. Davison for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the appellants. Leave was granted counsel to file additional memoranda by tomorrow.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
236. vs.
The United States.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Frierson for the appellant, continued by Mr. James Byrne for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond, Snyder & Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
Baltimore Grain Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen Spencer Mussey, It is ordered that Zaidee E. Green, ~~Esquire,~~ of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that John H. Connaughton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that David Bennett Sain, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, It is ordered that Joe J. Manlove, Esquire, of Joplin, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Marianna Matthews, Plaintiff in Error,
297. vs.
Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer etc.
Mortimer Matthews, Plaintiff in Error,
298. vs.
Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer etc.

These cases were continued, per stipulation.

Samuel Freshman, Plaintiff in Error,
300. vs.
W. S. Atkins.

This cause was continued, on motion of Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond, Snyder & Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
Baltimore Grain Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H.C. Jones Company, Inc.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. H. E. Lee Marshall for the defendants in error.

The United States, Appellant,
319. vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the appellant, and by Mr. M. C. Elliott for the appellee.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
120. vs.
T. H. Dunn et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter A. Ledbetter for the appellant, continued by Mr. George S. Ramsey for the appellees T. H. Dunn and H. E. Dunn, by Mr. William G. Davisson for the appellees J. Robert Gillam and wife, and concluded by Mr. W.W. Dyar for the appellant.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
129. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

Proclamation being madethe Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is ordered that Joseph O'Brien, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger Sholes, It is ordered that Gerard J. Pillod, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright, It is ordered that Walter E. Burke, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Augustus T. Seymour, It is ordered that Francis G. Awalt, Esquire, of Laurel, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, It is ordered that Allen Charlton, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Laurence M. Lombard, Esquire, of Winchester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion E. Rhodes, It is ordered that John M. Lewis, Esquire, of Seymour, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury, It is ordered that Robert F. Leach, Jr., Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cloud R. Marshall, It is ordered that Antoinette D. Hechmer, ~~Esquire~~, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard W. McElroy, It is ordered that Constantine A. Tsangadas, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Clark, It is ordered that Ray L. Selden, Esquire, of Daytona Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Huger, It is ordered that E. Willoughby Middleton, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace T. Jones, It is ordered that Thomas Richard Callahan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,
284. vs.
Davis Roberts, Trustee etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Perry S. Olson et al., Doing Business, etc., as Olson Bros., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
128. vs.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.
(Announced by Mr.Chief Justice Taft).

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Henderson Water Company, Appellant,
851. vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance and place this cause on the summary docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado, Appellant,
234. vs.
Roger W. Toll, Superintendent etc.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.-

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oluf O. Gilseth,
Plaintiff in Error,
248. vs.
A. G. Risty et al.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Minnehaha County, State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Minnehaha County, State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Brambini et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
238. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Brambini et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
259. vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The County of Tuolumne et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
281. vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

~~In Error to the District Court of the~~
E. E. McCalla Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
321. vs.
The People of the State of California.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby,

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cattina Sala, Plaintiff in Error,
356. vs.
A. Crane et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bacon & Matheson Forge Company et al.,
Appellants,
196. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
48. vs.
Hammond, Snyder & Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
49. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
50. vs.
H. C. Jones Company, Inc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner,
891. vs.
Edith F. Coogan, Special Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company of Hartford, Petitioner,
922. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Ross, Plaintiff in Error,
396. vs.
The State of South Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph L. Lackner, Administrator, Petitioner,
834. vs.
Merritt Starr, Surviving Partner of the Firm of Miller & Starr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pere Marquette Railway Company, Petitioner,
892. vs.
Loveland & Hinyan et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. W. Ewing, Petitioner,
904. vs.
E. B. Shauver et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Butterick Company et al.,
Petitioners,
906. vs.
The Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Smale, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners,
917. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris M. Becher, Petitioner,
941. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morray B. Birnbaum, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 942. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tan Pho et al., Petitioners, vs. Faustino Lichauco, as Guardian etc. 945. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the Circuits, agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit,	Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit,	Harlan Fiske Stone, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit,	Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit,	William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit,	Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit,	James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit,	Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit,	Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit,	George Sutherland, Associate Justice.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 23d, until Monday, April 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
734. vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.
for The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector etc., Petitioner,
931. vs.
Emma B. Johnson, as Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney V. Lowell for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
939. vs.
Hamilton Michelson & Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
943. vs.
Middleton & Company, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Huger for the respondents.

The United States ex rel. F.C.Rutz, Appellant,
935. vs.
Robert R.Levy, U.S.Marshal etc.
The United States ex rel.R.R.Fauntleroy, Appellant,
936. vs.
Robert R. Levy, U.S.Marshal etc.
The United States ex rel.J.F.Stenseck, Appellant,
937. vs.
Robert R.Levy,U.S.Marshal etc.
The United States ex rel. Harry C. Wanner, Appellant,
938. vs.
Robert R. Levy,U.S.Marshal etc.

The stipulation that the record in No. 935 be printed, and that these cases be heard on said record, was granted, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Hiawassee River Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
650. vs.
Carolina Tennessee Power Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. C. Martin for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. Crawford Biggs, Mr. John H. Frantz, and Mr. R. M. McConnell for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District,
Appellant,
135. vs.
J. B. Bond, Project Manager etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Will R. King in that behalf, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief herein for the appellant.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
75. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. F. W. McReynolds in that behalf.

Southern Electric Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
301. vs.
Francis R. Stoddard, Jr., Superintendent etc., et al.

The stipulation and motion to substitute James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, in the place of Francis R. Stoddard, Jr., resigned, as a party defendant in error in this cause, was granted, on motion of Mr. William H. Donovan in that behalf.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

Leave was granted to file a brief of Mr. Louis Marshall for the American Jewish Committee, herein, as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. F. R. Brylawski in that behalf.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
269. vs.
Walnut Ridge-Alicia Road Improvement District.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. F. Loughborough, and Mr. A. W. Dobyns for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. Harry L. Ponder for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Beatrice J. Weston et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
775. vs.
The City of Tulsa etal.

The motion to overrule the designation of the defendants in error as to parts of record to be printed was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. I. J. Underwood for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Carlos M. Ramirez Lopez, Petitioner,
912. vs.
American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose A. Poventud for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis H. Dexter for the respondent.

Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Company, Petitioner,
918. vs.
Eugenie Cognet et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the petitioner; with leave to counsel for the respondents to file brief on or before April 7th next, on motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler in that behalf.

The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
948. vs.
Edgar Stark, Executor etc.
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
949. vs.
The Union Savings Bank & Trust Company.
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
950. vs.
Lawrence Maxwell, Jr.
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
951. vs.
Edgar Stark, Executor etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the petitioner.

Nick Cholakos, Petitioner,
953. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis B. Kavanaugh for the petitioner.

Marcus Garvey, Petitioner,
969. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Salt Lake County,
Plaintiff in Error,
312. vs.
Utah Copper Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Clegg et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
357. vs.
The City of Spartanburg et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lois P. Myers, Administratrix etc.,
Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

This cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, April 13th next, at the head of the call for that day, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Southern Electric Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
301. vs.
Francis R. Stoddard, Jr., Superintendent etc.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
129. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. C. E. Miller for the respondent.

Joshua W. Miles, Formerly U. S. Collector, Plaintiff in Error,
53. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William L. Marbury for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William L. Rawls for the defendant in error.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.,
Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

Five hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Willis S. Moore for the appellants, and continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the appellee in No. 583.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, It is ordered that George Holmes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean H. Stanley, It is ordered that Morris J. Hirsch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Wallace R. Middleton, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, It is ordered that Roy E. Brownell, Esquire, of Flint, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey Hackett, It is ordered that Fremont A. Higgins, Esquire, of New York City,

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Apalachicola Land and Development Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. W. A. McRae, Commissioner etc. — 304.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Concrete Appliances Company et al., Petitioners, vs. John E. Gomery et al. — 307.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants, vs. The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary. — 583.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants, vs. Hill Military Academy. — 584.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the appellee in No. 583; by Mr. J. P. Kavanaugh for the appellee in No. 583; by Mr. George E. Chamberlain for the Governor of Oregon, one of the appellants in No. 584; by Mr. Willis S. Moore for the appellants in No. 584; and by Mr. John C. Veatch for the appellee in No. 584; and concluded by Mr. Albert H. Putney for the Governor of Oregon, one of the appellants in No. 584.

D. B. Robertson, Appellant, vs. Railroad Labor Board. — 739.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Vandervort, It is ordered that Frank W. Nesbitt, Esquire, of Wheeling, West Virginia; and Mason G. Ambler, Esquire, of Parkersburg, West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that T. Ludlow Chrystie, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Modern Woodmen of America,
Petitioner,
308. vs.
Jennie Vida Mixer.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Nelson C. Pratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. J. McCarthy and Mr. George W. Leamer for the respondent.

D. B. Robertson, Appellant,
739. vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert N. Golding for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the appellant.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Board of County Commissioners of Osage County. 767.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. W. Williams for the appellant, and by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the appellee.

Hidemitsu Toyota vs. The United States. 231.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. M. Lombard for Hidemitsu Toyota, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for The United States. Leave was granted to proceed in forma pauperis herein, on motion of Mr. L. M. Lombard for Hidemitsu Toyota.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Hubert Work, Secretary etc. 302.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. W. Clements for the appellant, and continued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. S. Curtis, It is ordered that George C. King, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, It is ordered that Maurice R. Woulfe, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that John P. Woods, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Jose Moreno, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

M. Frank Donohue,
Plaintiff in Error,
314. vs.
The State of Maine.

Frank C. Power,
Plaintiff in Error,
315. vs.
The State of Maine.

These cases were continued, per stipulation.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
302. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Francis W. Clements for the appellant.

Yee Hem, Plaintiff in Error,
303. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gerard J. Pilliod for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the defendant in error.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
305. vs.
The City of Parkersburg.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank W. Mesbit for the appellant, continued by Mr. R. B. McDougle for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. F. P. Moats for the appellee.

New York Central Railroad Company
306. vs.
Frank P. Chisholm, Administrator.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry for the New YorkCentral Railroad Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Thomas F. Donnelly, Petitioner,
326. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court, Middlesex County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that the petitioner herein has failed to prosecute his petition for a writ of certiorari within the time prescribed by Section 4 of Rule 37,

Therefore, on consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company
306. vs.
Frank P. Chisholm, Administrator.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. William H. Lewis for Frank P. Chisholm, Administrator.

The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Appellant,
310. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Clay Cooke, Petitioner,

311. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the respondent.

Duollut & Williams Company, Inc., Appellant,

317.& 318. vs.

The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Lee H. Schminck, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Gerson C. Young, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan, It is ordered that Alexander S. Greenbaum, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Hamilton, It is ordered that George E. Hamilton, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Leopold V. Freudberg, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Charles H. Baly, Esquire, of Somerset, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that Sidney Teiser, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Donald Havens, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland A. Newton, It is ordered that Leland A. Wind, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of This Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Sullivan, It is ordered that William Henry Gallagher, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland C. Newton, It is ordered that Bayless L. Cuffy, Esquire, of Hayti, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, It is ordered that Ernest H. Pappas, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Miller, It is ordered that Alton Gumbiner, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton K. Fox, It is ordered that H. Thane Bauman, Esquire, of Adrian, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Solicitor General Beck presented the Honorable John G. Sargent, Attorney General of the United States, and it was ordered that his Commission be recorded.

Calvin Coolidge,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity and Abilities of John G. Sargent, of Vermont, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Attorney General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office, according to law, and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him the said John G. Sargent, during the pleasure of the President of the United States, for the time being.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these Letters to be made Patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this seventeenth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-ninth.

Calvin Coolidge.

By the President:

Frank B. Kellogg,

Secretary of State.

The United States, Appellant,

319. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

P. Lorillard Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America

734. vs. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

Jose Candelaria et al. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hiawassee River Power Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

650. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court

Carolina Tennessee Power Company. of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

269. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court

Walnut Ridge-Alicia Road Improvement District of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beatrice J. Weston et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
775. vs.
The City of Tulsa et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the motion of the plaintiffs in error to overrule the designation filed in behalf of the defendants in error that the entire record as certified to this Court by the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma be printed, be, and the same is hereby, denied, for the reason that the plaintiffs in error in their designation of the portions to be printed have not complied with rule 10, paragraph 9, requiring them to file with the Clerk a statement of the points on which they intend to rely, to accompany the parts of the record which they have designated for printing. When the plaintiffs in error shall have filed such statement with the Clerk, together with proof of the service of the same on the defendants in error and the defendants in error take no further action, they may renew the motion now denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
931. vs.
Emma P. Johnson, as Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

William Stevens, Petitioner,
928. vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos M. Ramirez Lopez,
Petitioner,
912. vs.
American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Petitioner,
939. vs.
Hamilton Michelson & Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
943. vs.
Middleton & Company, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
948 vs.
Edgar Stark, Executor etc.
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
949. vs.
The Union Savings Bank & Trust Company, ~~Petitioner,~~
~~950. vs.~~
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
950. vs.
Lawrence Maxwell, Jr.
The Bauer Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
951. vs.
Edgar Stark, Executor etc.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

March 23, 1925.

Nick Cholakos, Petitioner,
953. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marcus Garvey, Petitioner,
959. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
911. vs.
Wyckoff Pipe & Creosoting Company, etc.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, and by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
960. vs.
James Daugherty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Daugherty, pro se.

Meyer Selzman, Plaintiff in Error,
998. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for supersedeas and to admit to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. S. Bailey for the plaintiff in error.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.
Chang Chan et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

Leave was granted to file a brief of Henry W. Taft herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Paxton Blair in that behalf.

William O'Hara et al.,
Petitioners,
772. vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in behalf of Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioners.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
270. vs.
Southern Photo Materials Company.

The joint request to restore this cause to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel MacDougald in that behalf.

Patrick J. Collins et al.,
Petitioners,
955. vs.
Anna C. Gibson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Sullivan for the petitioners.

Fenner & Beane, Petitioner,
956. vs.
T. G. Holt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Burt W. Henry, John E. Hall, Mr. Warren Grice, Mr. Charles J. Bloch, and Mr. L. C. Going for the petitioner.

Warren W. Willmering, Petitioner,
957. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Morrow for the petitioner.

Sven Nyquist, Petitioner,
963. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. McCrossin for the petitioner.

F. G. Buffington, Petitioner, 965. vs. The State of Georgia. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. B. Eubanks for the petitioner.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, 966. vs. Annie Nixon, Administratrix. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph Harrison for the petitioner.

Jose Alejandrino, Petitioner, 972. vs. Manuel L. Quezon et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioner.

Michael J. Derby, Owner of the Barge "George J. Conway", Petitioner, 975. vs. Steamtug "Panther", Her Engines etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for ~~a writ of certiorari herein~~ the Second Circuit was submitted by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. James K. Symmers for the respondent.

Little Six Oil Company, Petitioner, 978. vs. Marie T. Emerson et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the petitioner.

Charles Hammer, Petitioner, 993. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the petitioner.

Camden Fire Insurance Association,
Petitioner,
996. vs.
United States Manufacturers' Export Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dix W. Noel and Mr. Arthur W. Clement for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. McManus for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
791. vs.
New York & Pennsylvania Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. R. White for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Parker McCollester, Mr. Henry Wolfe Bikle, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
888. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Smith, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause as to plaintiffs in error Harry B. O'Connor, Daniel L. Jemison, Geronimo Perez, and James F. Daves,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as to plaintiffs in error Harry B. O'Connor, Daniel L. Jemison, Geronimo Perez, and James F. Daves.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 13th next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arlon V. Cushman, It is ordered that Richard B. Cavanaugh, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Philip Ludwell Leidy, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arlon V. Cushman, It is ordered that Maxwell James, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, It is ordered that Edwin Dabney, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that John B. Hyde, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Charles Chauncey Savage, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Frank G. Raichle, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that J. R. Wilson, Esquire, of Eldorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Sam R. Sayers, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that J. Dudley Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, It is ordered that E. C. Alvord, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Thomas L. Newton, Esquire, of Buffalo,

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin Brown, It is ordered that James Conlon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Ernest W. McIntyre, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Edward M. Seymour, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, It is ordered that Peter tum Suden, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that George A. McGowan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Parker Jones, It is ordered that Matt Marshall Morgan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice H.Winger,It is ordered that David M. Proctor, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that John J. Beilman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allen Ewarts Foster, It is ordered that William J. Dean, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew T. Smith, It is ordered that Isaac B. Lipson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Ira Lloyd Letts, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

A. L. May, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of George W. Cowen Company, Inc., Petitioner,
126. vs.
J. M. Henderson, Jr., and T. J. Scannell.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
130. vs.
T. H. Dunn et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, with respect only to the defendants T. H. Dunn, M. E. Dunn, J. Robert Gillam and Mrs. J. Robert Gillam, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, as to the other defendants, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Lucy Ward Stebbins and Frank J. Hurley, as Executrix and Executor of the Will of Henrietta Pierce Watkinson, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
227. vs.
Ray L. Riley, Controller of the State of California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmedwith costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States, Appellant,
527. vs.
Harriet Rogers Flannery and J. Rogers Flannery, Executors of the Estate of James J. Flannery, deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
733. vs. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of
Charles H. Ludington. Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Sanford.
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 12, Original.—October Term, 1924.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Colorado.

[April 13, 1925.]

This cause having been heard and submitted, and the Court having considered the same and announced its conclusions in an opinion delivered January 26, 1925,

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed:

1. The bill of the State of New Mexico is dismissed, and the cross-bill of the State of Colorado is sustained.

2. The true and lawful boundary between the State of New Mexico and the State of Colorado consists of the following connecting lines: (a) The line extending westwardly from what is known as the Preston Monument, marking the intersection of the thirty-seventh parallel of north latitude with the Cimarron Meridian (the one-hundred and third) of longitude west from Greenwich, to what is known as the Macomb Monument, as the said line was surveyed and marked in the year 1900 by Levi S. Preston, deputy surveyor, while engaged, under the direction of the Surveyor General for New Mexico, in re-tracing and re-marking between said Cimarron Meridian and Macomb Monument the line that had been surveyed in the year 1874 by John J. Major, astronomer and surveyor, under the direction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office; and (b) The line extending westwardly from said Macomb Monument to the intersection of said parallel of latitude with the one-hundred and ninth meridian of west longitude, as the said line was surveyed and marked in the year 1868 by Ehud N. Darling, surveyor and astronomer, under the direction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office; *Provided that*, pursuant to the consent of the parties hereto, the line surveyed and marked in the year 1917 by Wm. C. Perkins, surveyor, under the direction of the Commissioner of the Land Office, as a restoration of the said Darling line between the 293rd mile corner and Astronomical

8. If, for any reason, there occurs a vacancy in the commissionership when the Court is not in session, the same may be filled by the designation of a new commissioner by the Chief Justice.

9. All the costs of the cause, including the compensation and expenses of the commissioner, shall be borne in equal parts by the State of New Mexico and the State of Colorado.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company, Petitioner,
160. vs.
Arthur H. Van Pelt.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Appellant,
178. vs.
Anderson County, Texas; the City of Palestine, Texas; George A. Wright, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mid-Northern Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error,
256. vs.
J. W. Walker, as Treasurer of the State of Montana; Joseph M. Dixon, Governor of the State of Montana, C. T. Stewart, Secretary of State of the State of Montana, et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District, Appellant, vs. J. B. Bond, Project Manager of Boise Project of the United States Reclamation Service, and Payette-Boise Water Users' Association, Limited. 135.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States for the Fifth District of New Jersey, Petitioner, vs. The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey. 129.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey with instructions to modify the judgment in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Industrial Association of San Francisco, California Industrial Council, Industrial Association of Santa Clara County, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 365.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Parkersburg. 305. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Parkersburg. 305. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is herpby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The City of Parkersburg. 305. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to remand the cause to the

District Court of the United States for the District of West Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Department of Public Works of Washington et al.
371. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

A. J. Oliver, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of West Coast Rubber Corporation; Oscar Courtin, Dorothy E. Knight, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America and The City and County of San Francisco.
180. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

C. O. Linder, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.
183. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Alaska Steamship Company, 294. vs. Bernard McHugh. — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

New York Central Railroad Company, 306. vs. Frank P. Chisholm, Administrator etc. — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered as follows:

The Administrator had no right of action based upon the Federal Employers' Liability Act. The carrier was subject only to such obligations as were imposed by the laws and statutes of the country where the alleged act of negligence occurred; and the administrator could not rely upon any others.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Doullut & Williams, Inc.,
Appellant,
317. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Doullut & Williams Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
318. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chas. Wolff Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
207. vs.
The Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chas. Wolff Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
299. vs.
The Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

John O. Yeiser, Plaintiff in Error,
130. vs.
T. B. Dysart, Frank S. Howell, Nelson T. Pratt, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John Alden Lee, Individually and as Trustee of Lewis C. Paine,
Appellant,
222. vs.
Lehigh Valley Coal Company and Kate P. Dixon.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Modern Woodmen of America,
Petitioner,
308. vs.
Jennie Vida Mixer.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Susie Wells, Administratrix of the Estate of Charles E. Wells, Deceased, Appellants,
144. vs.
Jesse Bodkin and Arabella Bodkin, Heirs-at-Law of Patrick H. Bodkin, deceased.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al., Appellants,
170. vs.
E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J.B.White, deceased.

E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J. B.White, deceased, Appellant,
171. vs.
Charles B. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the said cross-appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western & Atlantic Railroad,
Appellant,
209. vs.
Georgia Public Service Commission, Paul B. Trammell, James A. Perry, et al.,etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Steele, Appellant,
235. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Steele, Plaintiff in Error,
636. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
302. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clay Cooke, Petitioner,
311. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States, Appellant,
911. vs.
Wyckoff Pipe & Creosoting Company, Inc.

It is ordered by this Court, that the further consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings be, and

The United States, Appellant,
920. vs.
Swift & Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Meyer Selzman, Plaintiff in Error,
998. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for supersedeas and to admit to bail,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied; and that the cause be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
791. vs.
New York & Pennsylvania Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William O'Hara et al., Petitioners,
772. vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

April 13, 1925.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York
270. vs.
Southern Photo Materials Company.

On consideration of the joint request to restore this cause to the call,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint request be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Parker, Petitioner,
696. vs.
The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for failure to submit the same within the time prescribed in Rule 37, Paragraph 4.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
767. vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
960. vs.
James Daugherty.

Order allowing certiorari. Filed April 13, 1925.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner. vs. Annie Nixon, Administratrix. 966. Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jose Alejandrino, Petitioner, vs. Manuel L. Quezon et al. 972. Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Hammer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 993. Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Appellant, vs. Michigan Trust Company, Receiver etc. 897. Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
898. vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie M. Williams, etc., Executrix etc., et al., Petitioners,
854. vs.
Freeman B. Christopher.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ella Foley, Administratrix, Petitioner,
871. vs.
New York, Ontario & Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. Collins et al., etc., Petitioners,
955. vs.
Anna C. Gibson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fenner & Beane, Petitioner, vs. T. G. Holt. 956. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren W. Willmering, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 957. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sven Myquist, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 963. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael J. Derby, Owner etc.,

Petitioner,

973. vs.

Steam Tug "Panther", Her Engines etc., New York Marine Company, Claimant.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Camden Fire Insurance Association, Petitioner,

996. vs.

United States Manufacturers Export Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James D. Barton, Petitioner,

840. vs.

Leyte Asphalt & Mineral Oil Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.-

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. G. Buffington, Petitioner, vs. The State of Georgia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

965.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order of the Court:

ORDER. It is ordered by the Court that General Order in Bankruptcy No. 5, entitled "Frame of petition", be amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence:

Petitioners in involuntary proceedings whose claims rest upon assignment or transfer from other persons shall annex to one of the duplicate petitions all instruments of assignment or transfer, and an affidavit setting forth the true consideration paid for the assignment or transfer of such claims and stating that the petitioners are the bona fide holders and legal and beneficial owners thereof, and whether or not they were purchased for the purpose of instituting bankruptcy proceedings.

And it is further ordered that the following rules be adopted and established as an additional General Orders in Bankruptcy:

XXXIX.

Representation of Creditors by their Attorneys. Receivers or

Neither a Receiver nor his Attorney shall solicit any proof of debt, power of attorney, or other authority to act for or represent any creditor for any purpose in connection with the administration of the estate in bankruptcy or the acceptance or rejection of any composition offered by a bankrupt.

XL.

Receivers and Marshals as Custodians.

A Receiver or Marshal appointed by the Court to take charge of the property of a bankrupt after the filing of a petition shall be deemed to be a mere custodian within the meaning of Section 48 of the Bankruptcy

Act, unless his duties and compensation are specifically enlarged by order of the Court, upon proper cause shown, either at the time of the appointment or later.

XLI.

Waiver of Right to Share in Composition Deposits.

Before confirming a composition the Judge of the Court shall require all creditors and other persons who may have waived their right to share in the distribution of the deposit made by the bankrupt, for claims, fees, or otherwise, to set forth in writing and under oath all agreements with respect thereto with the bankrupt, his attorney, or any other person, and shall also require an affidavit by the bankrupt that he has not directly or indirectly paid or promised any consideration to any attorney, trustee, receiver, creditor, or other person in connection with the composition proceedings, except as set forth in such affidavit or the offer of composition, and that he has no knowledge of any such payment or promise by any other party.

XLII.

Compensation of Attorneys, Receivers, and Trustees.

1. Every attorney, receiver and trustee, seeking an allowance of compensation from a bankrupt estate for services rendered shall file with the referee a petition under oath, setting forth a full and detailed statement of such services and the amount claimed therefor, and, in the case of an attorney or receiver, the amount of the partial allowance, if any, theretofore made. And such petition shall be accompanied by an affidavit of the applicant stating that no agreement has been made, directly or indirectly, and that no understanding exists, for a division of fees between the applicant and the receiver, the trustee, the bankrupt, or the attorney of any of them. In the absence of such petition and affidavit no allowance of compensation shall be made.

2. Such petition shall be heard at a meeting of creditors; and the referee in sending the notice of such meeting prescribed by Section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, shall state by whom and in what amount the allowance of the compensation is asked.

XLIII.

Fees and Expenses of Attorneys for Petitioning Creditors.

The Court may deny the allowance of any fee to the attorney for

petitioning creditors or the reimbursement of his expenses, or both, if it shall appear that the proceedings were instituted in collusion with the bankrupt or were not instituted in good faith.

XLIV.

Appointment of Attorneys and Receivers or Trustees.

In any District in which there is a city having at the last Federal census a population of 250,000 or more, no attorney for a receiver or a trustee shall be appointed except upon the order of the Court, which shall be granted only upon the petition of the Receiver or trustee, stating the name of the counsel whom he wishes to employ, the reasons for his selection, and the necessity for employing counsel at all; and there shall be submitted with this petition an affidavit of the person recommended, showing that he is not employed by or connected with the bankrupt or any person having an interest adverse to the receiver, trustee, or creditors.

XLV.

Auctioneers, Accountants and Appraisers.

No auctioneer or accountant shall be employed by a Receiver or Trustee except upon an order of the Court expressly fixing the amount of the compensation or the rate or measure thereof. The compensation of appraisers shall be provided for in like manner in the order appointing them.

(Promulgated April 13, 1925).

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al., Appellants, vs. William F. Waldow, Sheriff etc., et al.
509.

The motion to substitute Frank M. Tyler, present Sheriff of Erie County, New York, as a party appellee herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States ex rel. F. C. Rutz, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, U. S. Marshal etc.
935.

The United States ex rel. R. R. Fauntleroy, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, U. S. Marshal etc.
936.

The United States ex rel. J. F. Steneck, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, U. S. Marshal etc.
937.

The United States ex rel. Harry C. Wanner, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, U. S. Marshal etc.
938. vs. 938.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Herbert Pope, Mr. Frank E. Harkness, and Mr. Benjamin M. Price for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,
1026. vs.
P. Chauncey Anderson et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
393. vs.
A. E. Bauch et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
394. vs.
C. F. Waterman et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
395. vs.
A. E. Bauch.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and

James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc., Petitioner,
786.& 787.vs.
E. H. Pringle, Trustee.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
2,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Tennessee.

This cause was submitted, on exceptions of the State of Tennessee to the Report of the Boundary Commissioners, by Mr. Caruthers Ewing, Mr. Hal L. Norwood, and Mr. J. S. Utley for the complainant, and by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., Mr. Albert W. Biggs, Mr. G. F. Fitzhugh, and Mr. F. M. Thompson for the defendant.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,
325. vs.
E. Palmer Gavit.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the Estate of Emily L. Moore.

Tampico Banking Company, S. A., Petitioner,
975. vs.
R. S. Barber.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hampton Gary and Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the petitioner.

Schweyer Electric & Manufacturing Company et al., Petitioners,
1014. vs.
Regan Safety Devices Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper and Mr. Irving M. Obreight for the petitioners, and by Mr. John J. Kirby and Mr. A. V. Cushman for the respondents.

Roswell O. Johnson et al., Petitioners,
974. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Tinkham and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioners.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
785. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

The motion to affirm or place this cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm and Mr. William B. Symmes, Jr., for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Duncan K. Brent, Mr. Francis R. Cross, and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
668. vs.
Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Harrigan and Mr. Joseph W. Catharine in that behalf.

William H. Edwards, Collector etc., Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. George Wellwood Murray and Mr. Harrison Tweed in that behalf.

C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Russell L. Bradford in that behalf.

Leon Israel et al., Petitioners,
1057. vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Dean, Mr. Charles C. Burlingham, and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Peter S. Carter and Mr. Robert Phillips for the respondent.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,
325. vs.
E. Palmer Cavit.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Isaac B. Lipson for the Executor of the Estate of Anna B. Austin, deceased.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,
325. vs.
E. Palmer Gavit.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wayne Johnson in that behalf; and the motion was denied.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

Chang Chan et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. A. Warner Parker in that behalf.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Roger O'Donnell in that behalf.

Henry F. DuPont, Plaintiff in Error,
686. vs.
Cornelius R. Miller, as Director of Public Works and Buildings, etc.

The motion to substitute Oscar E. Carlstrom, present Attorney General of the State of Illinois, as a party defendant in error herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde L. Day and Mr. John J. Brilman for certain defendants in error.

William H. Edwards, Collector etc., Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf.

Frank C. Branwell, Superintendent of Banks of the State of Oregon, Appellant,
706. vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Hampson and Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the appellee.

Grace Edna Layne, Appellant,
No.___. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion for leave to docket this cause and proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. McCarron for the appellant.

Charles Dick et al., Petitioners,
969. vs.
Marx & Rawolle, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. Winship Wheatley for the respondent.

Emelie W. Peacock, Appellant,
887. vs.
Mable G. Reinecke, Collector etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Pope, Mr. James J. Forstall, and Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

A. Guckenheimer & Brothers Company et al., Petitioners,
946. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Adolph Paleais, Petitioner,
952. vs.
Lewis H. Saper.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. M. Browne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert P. Levis for the respondent.

Citrus Soap Company of California, Petitioner,
954. vs.
Royal Lemon Products Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun for the petitioner.

Louis Abramson, Petitioner,
961. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Eugene L. Norton et al., Petitioners,
977. vs.
Frederick R. Babcock.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Ransom for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hartwell Cabell and Mr. B. F. Sturgis for the respondent.

Mahlon D. Thatcher, Trustee under the Last Will of Franklin A. Luce, deceased, et al., etc., Petitioners,
979. vs.
The Chicago Railways Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Roger Sherman, Mr. James M. Sheean, and Mr. Charles S. Babcock for the respondents.

United States Cast Iron Pipe & Foundry Company, Petitioner,
980. vs.
M. W. Sullivan, as Administrator of the Estate of D.G.Sullivan, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugo L. Black for the respondent.

Keystone Brewing Company et al., Petitioners, 983. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Knapp for the petitioners.

William Parmenter, Petitioner, 986. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Connally for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

David Baker, Petitioner, 987. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Connally for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Max Corrigan, Petitioner, 988. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Connally for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

James Quick, Petitioner, 989. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Connally and Mr. William Henry Gallagher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

John F. Downs et al., Petitioners, 1000. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt Lane for

the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
1007. vs.
Steamship "Northern Star", Her Engines etc., and Harry Luber.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerson C. Young for the respondent.

Sacramento Navigation Company, Petitioner,
1011. vs.
Milton H. Salz, Doing Business as E. Salz & Son.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Sanborn for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Hasket Derby for the respondent.

J. H. Mosely, petitioner,
1012. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Garner for the petitioner.

J. H. Mosely, Petitioner,
1013. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Garner for the petitioner.

Alice Cheney Baltzell, Petitioner,
1020. vs.
John J. Mitchell, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.
Hannah P. Weld, Petitioner,
1021. vs.
John J. Mitchell, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Holt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Continental Casualty Company et al., Petitioners,
1024. vs.
Alfred W. Agee, Administrator of the Estate of Elaine R. Agee, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Len O. Hooker, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioners, and by Mr. James H. DeVine and Mr. Charles R. Hollingsworth for the respondent.

M. M. Elkan et al., Petitioners,
1034. vs.
Sebastian Bridge District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the petitioners, and by Mr. James B. McDonough for the respondent.

Ivory Novelties Trading Company, Petitioner,
38. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error,
672. vs.
Chevrolet Motor Company of California.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Sain et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
328. vs.
Cypress Creek Drainage District.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Lamar Williamson for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Charles T. Coleman for the defendant in error.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al., Appellants,
195. vs.
A. Sardell.

This cause was continued.

Lois P. Myers, Administratrix of Frank S. Myers, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

Three and three-quarters hours were allowed for the reargument of this cause. The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Will R. King for the appellant, and continued by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, It is ordered that George P. Lemon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Clark, It is ordered that Julius S. Harrison, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Russell T. Boswell, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error.
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick, Helen C. Frick, Childs Frick, et al., etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae, on motion of Mr. Dean C. Acheson for Alexander Lincoln and William R. Sears.

Lois P. Myers, Administratrix of the Estate of Frank S. Myers, deceased, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Will R. King for the appellant.

North Carolina Railroad Company, Petitioner,
322. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. R. Prince for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chapin Brown for the respondents.

North Laramie Land Company, Plaintiff in Error,
323. vs.
Albert E. Hoffman et al., etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. George G. King for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson, It is ordered that Ernest W. Marshall, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Jack Garrett Scott, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Gordon, It is ordered that Miles H. England, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, It is ordered that Nathan S. Blumberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, It is ordered that Milton M. Leichter, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error,

681. vs.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae, on motion of Mr. Peter H. Holme for Tyson S.Dynes et al.

William H. Edwards, Formerly U. S. Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,

324. vs.

The Cuba Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Howard Mansfield for the defendant in error.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,

325. vs.

E. Palmer Gavit.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. ~~James A. Fowler for the petitioner, and continued~~ Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. F. Towner for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

40. vs.

Gulf Refining Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. R. L. Batts for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Webster L. Blades, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Moses W. Rosenfeld, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that James F. Brennan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley H. Udy, It is ordered that John L. Hurlbert, Esquire, of Dunkirk, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Oscar A. Johannesen, Esquire, of Idaho Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker, It is ordered that John G. Sullivan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The exceptions of Durfee Mineral Company to the findings of law and fact and recommendations of Joseph M.Hill, Special Master, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. McCumber in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The Report of Joseph M. Hill, Special Master, was received and filed, on motion of Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The reply of T. P. Roberts and A. H. Britain to exceptions and brief of Durfee Mineral Company to the Report of Special Master Joseph M. Hill over royalties from Receiver Wells Nos. 152, 153 and 154, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf.

Mariana Viamonte Fernandez,
Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, Marshal of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. L. Batts and Mr. F. M. Swacker for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. John F. Finerty for James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads.

Charles Sherwin and Harry H. Schwarz, Petitioner,

379. vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. R. Sayers for the petitioners. The Court declined to hear further argument.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error,

681. vs.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. G. B. Gordon in behalf of Mr. William Marshall Bullitt. This cause was argued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George B. Gordon for the defendants in error.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,

768. vs.

Walter S. Dickey and Ralph Ellis.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,

847. vs.

The Baltimore Post.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore B. Benson, It is ordered that Harry Schwartz, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore B. Benson, It is ordered that Robert T. Tedrow, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, It is ordered that J. H. Mize, Esquire, of Gulfport, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl F. Phillips, It is ordered thatRobert P. Lattimore, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that James E. Dooley, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry M. Seidenberg, It is ordered that Robert H. Locke, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Holmes, It is ordered that Sanford H. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Russell P. Tyler, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The Fourteenth Report of the Receiver herein was received and filed, on motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf.

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
768. vs.
Walter S. Dickey et al.
The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
847. vs.
The Baltimore Post.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. M. H. Winzer and Mr. James A. Reed for the defendant in error in No.768, and concluded by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the defendant in error in No.847.

William R. Edwards, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
524. vs.
Archibald Douglas et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Matthew C. Fleming for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Paul Armitage for the respondent.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.

769. vs.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

Chang Chan et al.

770. vs.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederic D.McKenney for Cheung Sum Shee et al. in No. 769, and for Chang Chan et al. in No. 770.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Ernest May, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Rixey, It is ordered that John S. Stone, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodbury Blair, It is ordered that George Gardiner Fry, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Finerty, It is ordered that Nelson W. Proctor, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Andrew N. Eckstrom, Esquire, of Warren, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. T. Hainer, It is ordered that Clarence E. Miles, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. T. Hainer, It is ordered that Mrs. Cora C. Miles, of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, It is ordered that Gerald M. Johnson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Rixey, It is ordered that S. P. Smith, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Philip Stein, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Carrigan, It is ordered that Ellis Douthit, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David H. Leake, It is ordered that Sherlock Bronson, Esquire, of Richmond, State of

Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Samuel M. Richardson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that Walter J. Mattison, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that Alexander W. Schutz, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Barnett E. Marks, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
197. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al., Appellants, vs. William F. Waldow, as Sheriff of Erie County, et al. 509.

On consideration of the motion to substitute Frank M. Tyler, present Sheriff of Erie County, New York, as a party appellee in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Dexter & Carpenter, Inc. 783.

Further consideration of the motion to affirm in this cause was postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener. 13, Orig'l.

It is ordered by this Court that the hearing on the exceptions to the findings of Joseph M. Hill, Special Master, and the reply thereto, be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, April 20th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Chauncey Anderson et al. 1026.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Bramwell, Superintendent of Banks of the State of Oregon, Appellant, vs. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company. 706.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of Louis J. Bergdoll Motor Company,
Petitioner,
668. vs.
Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
786 & 787. vs.
E. H. Pringle, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Charles F. Boyd Company, Inc., Bankrupt.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, May 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mariano Viamonte Fernandez,
Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, Marshal of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
2, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Tennessee.

It is ordered by this Court that the hearing on the exceptions to the Report of the Commissioners in this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next; and the Clerk is directed to notify counsel to that effect.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Sain et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
328. vs.
Cypress Creek Drainage District.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission et al.,
Appellants,
30. vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument, and assigned for Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
1007. vs.
Steamship "Northern Star", Her Engines, etc., and Harry Luber.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sacramento Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
1011. vs.
Milton H. Salz, doing business as E. Salz & Son.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Guckenheimer & Brothers Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

946.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adolph Paleais, Petitioner, vs. Lewis H. Saper. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

952.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Citrus Soap Company of California, Petitioner, vs. Royal Lemon Products Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

954.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Abramson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

961.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Dick et al., Petitioners, vs. Marx & Rawolle, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

969.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roswell O. Johnson et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

974.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eugene L. Norton et al., Petitioners, vs. Frederick R. Babcock. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

977.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
April 20, 1925.

Mahlon D. Thatcher, Trustee under the Last Will of Franklin A.Luce, deceased, et al., etc., 979. vs. The Chicago Railways Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Keystone Brewing Company et al., Petitioners, 983. vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Downs et al., Petitioners, 1000. vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Mosely, Petitioner, 1012 & 1013. vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Schweyer Electric & Manufacturing Company et al., Petitioners,
1014. vs.
Regan Safety Devices Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alice Cheney Baltzell, Petitioner,
1020. vs.
John J. Mitchell, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hannah P. Weld, Petitioner,
1021. vs.
John J. Mitchell, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. M. Elkan et al., Petitioners,
1034. vs.
Sebastian Bridge District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Israel et al., Copartners doing business under the firm name of Leon Israel & Brox., Petitioners,
1057. vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
920. vs.
Swift & Company.

Swift & Company, Appellant,
921. vs.
The United States.

The joint motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

This cause was passed, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Appellant,
732. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Daniels for the appellant.

S. H. Davis et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
992. vs.
Alice Williford et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. Kappler for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Walker D. Hines, Late Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
643. vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

The motion to substitute James C. Davis, present Director General of Railroads, as the party petitioner herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake for the petitioner.

Pacific American Fisheries,
Petitioner,
844. vs.
Territory of Alaska.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in that behalf.

Joseph P. Margolin, Petitioner,
858. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in that behalf.

G. W. Coffee et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
593. vs.
Joseph F. Gray, Receiver etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. L. E. Jeffries and Mr. Sanders McDaniel for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi,
Appellant,
833. vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. W. Smith, Jr., in that behalf.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant.
873. vs.
W. H. Mason.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. Edward Wright in opposition thereto.

Carter Lynch, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Plaintiff in Error,
976. vs.
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Moore for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion.

Harry C. Grove, otherwise known as Hoppy Grove, Petitioner,
990. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Leach, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Pete Lucis, Petitioner,
999. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George D. Collins for the petitioner.

Henry V. Cunningham, Trustee, Petitioner,
1035. vs.
Merchants National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Sears and Mr. Clarence M. Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett and Mr. George S. Fuller for the respondent.

D. J. Ahearn et al., Petitioners,
1038. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eric Lyders for the petitioners.

Toyo Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Petitioner,
1042. vs.
William D. Oelbermann et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Knight and Mr. Joseph K. Hutchinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Hasket Derby for the respondents.

Frank Miller, Petitioner,
1043. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Golding and Mr. Joseph B. Fleming for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Hercules Powder Company, Petitioner,
1062. vs.
J. F. Rich.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gould G. Rhouby and Mr. William H. Robertson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Heartsell H. Ragon and Mr. J. H. Thompson for the respondent.

Boatmen's Bank, Petitioner,
1077. vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lambert E. Walther, Mr. Sears Lehmann, Mr. Walter H. Saunders, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. J. L. London for the petitioner.

C. C. Connally et al., Petitioners,
1082. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Mize for the petitioners.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
1087. vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. L. Becker & Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Johnston for the petitioner.

J. S. Hughes, Petitioner,
1061. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Beets for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William, Inman & Stribling,
Appellants,
358. vs.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Coal & Railway Company et al., Appellants,
368. vs.
The Hocking Valley Railway Company et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Wilson, Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt, and Mr. A.C. Rearick for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Burry and Mr. William O. Henderson for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Cheung Sum Shee et al.,
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.
Chang Chan et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. George A. McGowan for Cheung Sum Shee et al. in No. 769, and Chang Chan et al. in No. 770, and concluded

by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for John D. Nagle, as Commissioner etc.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

This cause was argued, on the exceptions to the Report of Joseph M. Hill, Special Master, by Mr. C. F. Greenwood for Durfee Mineral Company, and by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for T. T. Roberts and A. H. Britain.

Crew Levick Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

This cause was argued by Mr. David Wallerstein for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Walter Biddle Saul for the defendant in error.

Vincent L. Knewell, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

This cause was argued by Mr. B. S. Payne for the appellant, and by Mr. George W. Egan, pro se.

Domenico Dumbra et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles Marvin for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley B. Houck, It is ordered that Alvin E. Stein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, It is ordered that Mary Wooster Munson Sutton, of Red Bank, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The joint motion of complainant, defendant, and intervener, relating to the counterclaim of defendant affecting the boundary along the 100th Meridian; and motion of defendant for leave to file reply to replies of complainant and intervener to the amended counterclaim of defendant, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. W. Gregory in that behalf.

Domenico Dumbra et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles Marvin for the

plaintiffs in error, and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Keefer for the defendant in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
329. vs.
Reynolds-Davis Grocery Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, Mr. John P. Woods, and Mr. Harry P. Daily for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent, Plaintiff in Error,
331. vs.
L. L. Cohen & Company, Inc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Louis Sevig for the defendant in error.

B. F. Lee et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
336. vs.
Osceola & Little River Road Improvement District No. 1 of Mississippi County, Arkansas.

This cause was argued by Mr. Prewitt Semmes for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. T. Coston for the defendant in error.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al., Appellants,
509. vs.
Frank M. Tyler, Sheriff etc., etc., et al.

Four hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George P. Decker for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being madethe Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Joseph C. Colquitt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Cleon K. Calvert, Esquire, of Pineville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, It is ordered that William H. Robinson, Esquire, of Hampton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Middleton S. Berland, as Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Petitioner,
1085. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error,

681. vs.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.

Leave was granted to file a reply brief herein, on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy et al., Appellants,

509. vs.

Frank M. Tyler, Sheriff etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George P. Decker for the appellants, by Mr. H. C. Griffin for The State of New York, and concluded by Mr. W. W. Dyar for The United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix C. Benvenga, It is ordered that Robert D. Petty, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Domenico Dumbra et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.
The United States of America.

Leave was granted to file an additional authorities herein, on motion of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf.

Thomas Agnello et al.,
Petitioners,
45. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Gordon Battlefor the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
249. vs.
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. P. Thomas for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Charles J. Rixey for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. R. Brown for the respondent.

J. W. Patterson, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
764. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wandell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Ransom, It is ordered that Charles J. Denham, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Elliott, It is ordered that Herbert L. Iasigi, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. E. Eaton, It is ordered that Fleet C. Hathorn, Esquire, of Hattiesburg, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error,
352. vs.
A. P. Wooldridge, Receiver of the National Bank of Cleburne.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. John J. Hamilton for Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

J. W. Patterson, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
764. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiffs in error; by Mr. John F. Finerty for Davis, Director General of Railroads; by Mr. Nelson W. Proctor for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al., and concluded by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiffs in error.

The State of Colorado, Appellant,
234. vs.
Roger W. Toll, Superintendent of the Rocky Mountain National Park.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Boatright for the appellant, continued by Mr. Paul W. Lee for the appellant, and by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Paul W. Lee for the appellant.

The United States of America, Appellant,
337. vs.
Holt State Bank et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Alice B. Marion, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrian F. Busick, It is ordered that James M. Brinson, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, It is ordered that Edward Lawrence Springer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Partridge, It is ordered that George Canton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Paltridge, It is ordered that George Van Den Berg, Esquire, of Racine, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Reading Steel Casting Company, Plaintiff in Error,
233. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Yee Hem, Plaintiff in Error,
303. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Appellant,
310. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part, and reversed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Fourteenth District of New York, Petitioner,
325. vs.
E. Palmer Gavit.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Butler.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States, Appellant,
920. vs.
Swift & Company.

Swift & Company, Appellant,
921. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific American Fisheries, Petitioner,
844. vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi, Appellant,
833. vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph P. Margolin, Petitioner,
858. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace Edna Layne
——. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, on the ground that there is obviously no merit in the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., Appellant,
732. vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker D. Hines, Late Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
643. vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to substitute James C. Davis, present Director General of Railroads, in the place of Walker D. Hines, late Director General, as the party petitioner herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
873. vs.
W. H. Mason.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Coal & Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
368. vs.
The Hocking Valley Railway Company et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

On consideration of the joint motion to restore this cause to the call,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said joint motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for the end of the call on Monday, April 27th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

Order. The motion of the State of Texas for leave to file a reply to the replications of the State of Oklahoma and the United States to the amended counterclaim of the State of Texas relating to the interstate boundary along the one hundredth meridian is granted, and the reply tendered with such motion is ordered filed.

The joint motion of the State of Oklahoma, the State of Texas, and the United States respecting the making up and printing of the record on such counterclaim and the submission and hearing of the issues pertaining thereto is granted; the clerk is directed to make up and print the record as requested in the motion; and the hearing on the counterclaim is fixed for Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee, Petitioner,
1085. vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument with cases Nos. 786 and 787 heretofore assigned for Monday, May 4th next. The case to be submitted on printed briefs on that date, with the alternative to counsel to present this case on oral argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Company, Petitioner,
918. vs.
Eugene Cognet et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry C. Grove, otherwise known as Hoppy Grove, Petitioner,
990. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pete Lucis, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 999. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry V. Cunningham, Trustee, vs. Merchants National Bank. 1035. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. J. Ahearn et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1038. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Miller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1043. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. S. Hughes, Petitioner,
1061. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hercules Powder Company,
Petitioner,
1062. vs.
J. F. Rich.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boatmen's Bank, Petitioner,
1077. vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. C. Connally et al., Petitioners,
1082. vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia,
Petitioner,
1087. vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toyo Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha,
Petitioner,
1042. vs.
William D. Oelberman et al., Copartners etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for failure to file within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crew Levick Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Order. The call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 1st next. The Court will take a recess from Monday, May 4th, until Monday, May 11th next. The cases specially assigned for Monday, May 4th, will be heard.

Fort Smith Light & Traction Company, Plaintiff in Error,
220. vs.
Fagan Bourland et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the opinion heretofore filed be amended by inserting after the word "franchise" in the last sentence of the opinion the words "or indeterminate permit". Petition for rehearing denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
1009. vs.
Indianapolis Union Railway Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paxton Blair in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

Fidelity National Bank & Trust Company of Kansas City et al., Appellants,
930. vs.
Felix H. Swope et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of Mr. Elliott H. Jones for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Justin B. Bowersock, Mr. Arthur Miller, and Mr. Hunter M. Meriwether for the appellants in opposition thereto, with leave to counsel for the appellees to file an additional brief on or before Friday next.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. David Paine in that behalf.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
404. vs.
Mrs. Alice S. Dupuis.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh and Mr. W. M. Barrow for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. H. Randolph for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Morris Orsatti, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 1015.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The Commerce-Guardian Trust & Savings Bank, Petitioner, vs. The State of Michigan et al. 1016.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee H. Schmineck and Mr. George W. Ritter for the petitioner.

Clarence T. Parker, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1023.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl W. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the respondent.

Ellis C. Talmadge et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1032.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley and Mr. Edward M. Seymour for the petitioners.

Lynn Storage Warehouse Company, Petitioner, vs. Mordka Senator. 1040.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin N. Johnson, Mr. Hugh W. Ogden, and Mr. Edwin H. Abbott, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee M. Friedman for the respondent.

Kelly-Springfield Tire Company, Petitioner, vs. L. A. Bobo et al. 1047.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Preston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Olen L. Everts for the respondent.

Blanchard Lumber Company, Petitioner,
1047. vs.
Jesse H. Metcalf.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred T. Field for the petitioner, and by Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the respondent.

New York Dock Company, Petitioner,
1058. vs.
Steamship "Capitaine Faure", Her Engines etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.

Charleston, South Carolina, Mining & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
1074. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. William Wade Hampton for the petitionsr.

John L. Nounes et al., Petitioners,
1080. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Wayman for the petitioners.

A. J. Byars, Petitioner,
1086. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude R. Porter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the respondent.

E. P. Swinney, Petitioner,
1100. vs.
Gary Realty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank M. Lowe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1110. vs.
John J. Howell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan McCulloh and Mr. Clifton P. Williamson for the petitioners, and by Mr. John C. Robinson for the respondent.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al.
881. vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York et al.

The motion to bring up the whole record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. H. H. Loomis, Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, and Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer for Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al.

John C. Foster, Petitioner,
1083. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Foster, in propria persona.

Buffalo Union Furnace Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
189. vs.
The United States Shipping Board. Emergency Fleet Corporation.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Meyer Selzman, Plaintiff in Error,
998. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Gerald J. Pillod and Mr. J. C. Breitenstein for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error; with leave to counsel to file briefs hereafter.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
337. vs.
Holt State Bank et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. A. M. Eckstrom for the appellees.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc.,
Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Milburn for the appellant, and by Mr. Frank S. Grant for the appellee.

Southern Utilities Company,
Petitioner,
339. vs.
The City of Palatka.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. L. Ransom for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. H. Odom for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley D. Willis, It is ordered that Hiram E. Casey, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Spaulding, It is ordered that Harry Allen, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fleischmann Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
366. vs.
The United States of America to the use of G. W. Forsburg et al.

The suggestion of the bankruptcy of Fleischmann Construction Company, and motion to substitute Francis L. Kohlman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the said Fleischmann Construction Company, as a party plaintiff in error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi H. David in that behalf.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al., Appellants, vs. The Arkansas Valley Interurban Railway Company. 361.

This cause was continued.

Daisy M. Scott et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Columbus. 344.

This cause was continued.

William Danzer & Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company. 346.

This cause was argued by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. B. E. Eaton for the defendant in error.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant, vs. Lavina B. Donaldson. 348.

This cause was argued by Mr. John R. Rood for the appellant, and by Mr. John C. Spaulding for the appellee.

Reuben Weller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. 349.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Robert D. Petty for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. P. Buchanan, It is ordered that Charles A. Wilcox, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Louis W. Kaufman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; and Jo. Baily Brown, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard W. Smeli, It is ordered that James G. Moore, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, It is ordered that George R. Ewald, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Leo L. Weil, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George V. Triplett, Jr., It is ordered that William M. Johnston, Esquire, of Billings, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Reuben Weller, Plaintiff in Error,
349. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Robert D. Petty for the defendant in error.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Rosevale Realty Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
350. vs.
Albert E. Kleinert, as Superintendent of the Bureau of Buildings of the Borough of Brooklyn, City of New York, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Reass for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Joseph P. Reilly for the defendant in error, Albert E. Kleinert; and concluded by Mr. James Marshall for Midwood Manor Association and Kalvin, defendants in error.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error,
352. vs.
A. P. Wooldridge, Receiver of the National Bank of Cleburne.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. F. Seay for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Ellis Douthit for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that Edward J. McDonald, Esquire, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut; Francis P. Guilfoile, Esquire, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut; and Charles O'Connor, Esquire, of Waterbury, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, It is ordered that Blair Foster, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram M. Garwood, It is ordered that Elden Spencer Lazarus, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Driscoll, It is ordered that Michael A. Kiely, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Hollingsworth, It is ordered that Valentine Gideon, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen, It is ordered that Julius C. Travis, Esquire, of La Porte, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Eastern Products Corporation et al., Petitioners,
1127. vs.
Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to file the petition for certiorari and for an extension of time in which to file amended transcript of record within thirty days was granted, on motion of Mr. J. J. Lynch for the petitioners.

Municipal Assembly of Arroyo, Porto Rico, Petitioner,
369. vs.
Successors of C. & J. Fantauzzi.

The motion to quash the writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis E. Heagle for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply thereto on or before May 11th next.

Juan Perez Cami, Municipal Commissioner of Finance, Petitioner,
370. vs.
Central Victoria, Limited.

This cause was submitted by Mr. E. B. Wilcox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief within two weeks.

The United States, Appellant,
359. vs.
Elmo R. Royer.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

The United States, Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley for the respondent.

P

The United States, Appellant,
360. vs.
Daniel Noce.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the appellant, and by Mr. S. T. Ansell for the appellee.

Second Russian Insurance Company, Appellant,
362. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Albert P. Massey for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that J. H. McClintic, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia; Young B. Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Richard R. Powell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Alex N. Breckinridge, Esquire, of Summersville, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Steinem, It is ordered that Alexander H. Marshall, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Offutt, Jr., It is ordered that John H. Klette, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Noble Jones, It is ordered that Pierce E. Holmes, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Johnston, It is ordered that Frank B. Schraeder, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Johnston, It is ordered that George W. Cameron, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Second Russian Insurance Company, Appellant,	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Albert P. Massey for
362. vs.	the appellant, by Mr. Hartwell Cabell
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.	for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Albert P. Massey for the appellant.
Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees, Petitioners,	This cause was argued by Mr. T. J.
363. vs.	Wills for the petitioners, and by
Anna F. C. Martin et al.	Mr. Fleet C. Hathorn for the respondents.
D. S. Sowell, Plaintiff in Error,	This cause was argued by Mr. Ethan B.
367. vs.	Stroud, Jr., for the defendant in
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Texas.	error; and submitted by Mr. J. D. Williamson for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Finney, It is ordered that W. Carr Morrow, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Finney, It is ordered that Ebert K. Burlew, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted to practice.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that W. H. Fryer, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that John P. Barnes, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Frank P. Buck, Esquire, of Washington, Dis-

trict of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that William L. Murphy, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hill, It is ordered that James B. Whitfield, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that R. C. Fulbright, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. R. Prince, It is ordered that Nathaniel B. Barnwell, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, It is ordered that William I. Denning, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that J. B. Fasgre, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that James Moyle Gray, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Henry Gale, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Pollak, It is ordered that Carol Weiss King, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Jesse P. Crawford, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Frederick H. Horlbeck, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Benton, It is ordered that Hugh White, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Alpha Portland Cement Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
103. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Alpha Portland Cement Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
327. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Judicial Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al.,
Appellants,
54. vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Embden et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company,
Appellant,
1009. vs.
Indianapolis Union Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, under rule 32.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Alice S. Dupuis.
404. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al. vs. Central Union Trust Company of New York et al.
881. On consideration of the motion to bring up the whole record and cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Foster, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.
1083. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, as there is obviously no grounds for a writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fleischmann Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America to the use of G. W. Forsberg et al.
366. It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the suggestion of bankruptcy of Fleischmann Construction Company, and motion to substitute Francis L. Kohlman, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of said Fleischmann Construction Company, as one of the plaintiffs in error herein, be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
839. vs.
Jackson & Eastern Railway Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jaybird Mining Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
929. vs.
Joe Weir, as County Treasurer of Ottawa County, Oklahoma.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Byars, Petitioner,
1086. vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Howard
——.vs.
Bailey, Judge.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
800. vs.
A. N. Murphy et al., Partners etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris Orsatti, Petitioner,
1015. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence T. Parker, Petitioner,
1023. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
May 4, 1925.

Ellis C. Talmadge et al.,
Petitioners,
1032. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lynn Storage Warehouse Company,
Petitioner,
1040. vs.
Mordka Senator.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kelly-Springfield Tire Company,
Petitioner,
1047. vs.
L. A. Bobo et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blanchard Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
1048. vs.
Jesse H. Metcalf.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
1058. vs.
Steamship "Capitaine Faure", etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charleston, South Carolina, Mining and Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
1074. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Mounes et al., Petitioners,
1080. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. F. Swinney, Petitioner,
1100. vs.
Gary Realty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1110. vs.
John J. Howell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. Equity Rules 10 and 30 (226 U. S. appendix) are amended hereby to read as follows:

10.

Decree for Deficiency in Foreclosures, etc.

In suits for the foreclosure of mortgages or for the enforcement of other liens a decree may be rendered for any balance found to be due over and above the proceeds of the sale or sales; and execution may issue for the collection of the same as is provided in rule 8 when the decree is solely for the payment of money. Such a deficiency decree may be so rendered and enforced whether the plaintiff owns the debt or is a trustee or agent for another or others who own it, as often is true when the debt is evidenced by notes or bonds. Where the plaintiff is such trustee or agent, any money collected on the execution shall be paid to him as such representative, and he shall pay it to the owner of the debt if there be only one, and if there be more shall distribute it pro rata among them according to their respective interests.

30.

Answer---Contents---Counterclaim.

The defendant by his answer shall set out in short and simple terms his defense to each claim asserted in the bill, omitting mere statements of evidence and avoiding general denials, but specifically admitting, denying, or explaining the facts upon which the plaintiff relies, unless he is without knowledge, in which event he shall so state, and this shall be treated as a denial. Averments other than those of value or amount of damage, when not denied, shall be deemed confessed, except as against an infant, lunatic, or other person non compos and not under guardianship, but the answer may be amended, by leave of the court or judge, upon reasonable notice, so as to put any averment in issue, when justice requires it. The answer may state as many defenses, in the alternative, regardless of consistency, as the defendant deems essential to his defense.

The answer must state in short and simple form any counterclaim arising out of the transaction which is the subject matter of the suit, and may, without cross bill, set up any set-off or counterclaim against the plaintiff which might be the subject of an independent suit in equity against him, and such set-off or counterclaim, so set up, shall have the same effect as a cross suit, so as to enable the court to pronounce a final decree in the same suit on both the original and the cross claims.

When in the determination of a counterclaim complete relief can not be granted without the presence of parties other than those to the bill, the court shall order them to be brought in as defendants if they are subject to its jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is now here ordered by this Court that Section 7 of Rule 24 of this Court be amended so that the entire Section will read:

"In pursuance of the Act of March 3, 1883, authorizing and empowering this Court to prepare a table of fees to be charged by the Clerk of this Court, the following table is adopted:

For docketing a case and filing and indorsing the transcript of the record, ten dollars.

For entering an appearance, twenty-five cents.

For entering a continuance, twenty-five cents.

For filing a motion, order, or other paper, twenty-five cents.

For entering any rule, or for making or copying any record or other paper, twenty cents per folio of each one hundred words.

For transferring each case to a subsequent docket and indexing the same, one dollar.

For entering a judgment or decree, one dollar.

For every search of the records of the Court, one dollar.

For a certificate and seal, two dollars.

For receiving, keeping and paying money in pursuance of any statute or order of Court, two per cent. on the amount so received, kept and paid.

For an admission to the bar and certificate under seal, ten dollars.

For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer,

in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the justices, the reporter, the law library, and the parties or their counsel, ten cents per folio of each one hundred words, but where the necessary printed copies of the record as printed for the use of the court below are furnished charges under this item will be limited to any additions printed here under the clerk's supervision.

For making a manuscript copy of the record, when required under rule 10, twenty cents per folio of each one hundred words, but nothing in addition for supervising the printing.

For issuing a writ of error and accompanying papers, five dollars.

For a mandate or other process, five dollars.

For filing briefs, five dollars for each party appearing.

For every printed copy of any opinion of the Court or any justice thereof, certified under seal, two dollars."

This order shall apply to causes filed here on or after June 9th, 1925, but not to causes filed prior to that date.

Promulgated May 4, 1925.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama. — 888.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause as to plaintiff in error John McEvoy,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as to plaintiff in error John McEvoy.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leonard Metcalf et al., Copartners etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. John J. Mitchell, Former Collector etc. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Williams in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. — 675.

Byron A. Corey, Petitioner,
1072. vs.
Sunburst Oil & Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. McCumber in behalf of Mr. Louis P. Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Hurd for the respondent; with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant of the State of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
997. vs.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith, pro se.

Andrew G. Patterson et al.,
Appellants,
774. vs.
Mobile Gas Company.

The suggestion of diminution of the record, and motion for a writ of certiorari, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh White and Mr. Harwell G. Davis for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry T. Smith for the appellee in opposition thereto; with leave to counsel for the appellants to file a reply brief within five days.

John T. Porter Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1071. vs.
Java Coccanut Oil Company, Limited.

Leave was granted to file briefs of First National Bank of Seattle et al.; and of State Banking Department of the State of California et al., as amici curiae, herein, on motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf; opposition thereto was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Sutro, Mr. F. D. Madison, Mr. H. D. Pillsbury, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Omar Lenox Macklem,
Appellant,
968. vs.
Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The motion to admit the appellant to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Pollak for the appellant, with leave to counsel for the appellee to file a brief on or before Friday next and to counsel for the appellant to file a reply thereto within four days thereafter.

Claude C. Connally, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,
985. vs.
General Construction Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Short in that behalf.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,
___,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the complainant.

William A. Price et al., Petitioners,
1027. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Kraemer and Mr. Joseph Siegler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Reed, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Leon Fox, Petitioner,
1033. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Martin for the petitioner.

Jacob Marcus et al., Copartners etc., Petitioners,
1049. vs.
Pillsbury Flour Mills Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioners, and by Mr. George B. Gordon for the respondents.

Chickasha Cotton Oil Company, Petitioner,
1056. vs.
Homer H. Chapman et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. Coke and Mr. M. M. Crane for the petitioner.

John T. Porter Company et al., Petitioners,
1071. vs.
Java Cocoanut Oil Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., and Mr. A. Crawford Greene for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alfred Sutro, Mr. F. D. Madison, Mr. H. D. Pillsbury, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the respondent.

Dr. A. W. Boyd, Petitioner,
1075. vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam E. Whitaker for the petitioner.

The Western Automobile Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1076. vs.
George S. Robbins et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mitchell D. Follansbee and Mr. Fred Barth for the petitioner, and by Mr. James W. Good and Mr. Dwight S. Bobb for the respondents.

Minnie L. Bellamy, Petitioner,
1088. vs.
Willie G. Pitts et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Gunter for the petitioner.

Henry Mandel et al., Petitioners,
1151. vs.
The United States of America to the use of Wharton & Northern Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Campbell, Jr., for the respondents.

The Mosler Safe Company, Petitioner,
1143. vs.
Ely-Norris Safe Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Owen Edmonds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Julius M. Mayer and Mr. F. P. Warfield for the respondent.

American Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
507. vs.
Farmington Shoe Manufacturing Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1085. vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Harvey B. Cox for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
786 & 787. vs.
E. H. Pringle, as Trustee etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jerome Michael for the petitioner, continued by Mr. N. B. Barnwell for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent.

Mariano Vizmonte Fernandez,
Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, U. S. Marshal etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harold B. Kigar for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellant.

x Proclamation being made the court is adjourned until Monday, May 11th, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 11, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that John C. North, Esquire, of Easton, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that William S. Bronson, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Wilson Brown, III, It is ordered that Edwin R. Monnig, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty, It is ordered that Thomas F. Flaherty, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Townsend, It is ordered that Helen I. Binning, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that L. J. Bond, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, It is ordered that Stephen S. Szlapka, Esquire, of Phoenixville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Taylor, It is ordered that Henry Philip Farnham, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Henry A. Baker, Esquire, of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Wilson Brown, III, It is ordered that Harold Goodman, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

North Laramie Land Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

823. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

Albert E. Hoffman, Ulyssis S. Jones, George S. Martin, Individually etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
285. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Western Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
287. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

W. A. Cockrill and S. Ikada,
Plaintiff in Error,
182. vs.
The People of the State of California.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 13, Original.—October Term, 1924.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

[May 11, 1925.]

Mr. Justice Van Devanter delivered the opinion of the Court.

As an incident of the receivership in this cause it becomes necessary to determine conflicting claims to the royalty interest in the impounded proceeds of the oil taken from wells Nos. 152, 153 and 154. 258 U. S. 574, 581. These wells are immediately south of the south bank of Red River, and therefore in the State of Texas. 261 U. S. 340. The claimants are T. P. Roberts and A. H. Britain on the one hand and the Durfee Mineral Company on the other. Both claims are founded on Texas surveys—that of Roberts and Britain on the Lewis Powell survey made in 1861 and patented in 1868, and that of the Durfee Mineral Company on the A. A. Durfee survey made in 1886 and patented in 1889.

The principal question is whether the Powell survey extended northward to the south bank of Red River, leaving nothing between it and the bank, or stopped short of the bank, leaving a narrow wedge-shaped strip between it and the bank. The Durfee survey was made 25 years later on the assumption that the Powell survey left such a strip there. The three wells are in the wedge-shaped strip or land accreted to it. A secondary question is whether, if the Powell survey included this strip, the present owners of that survey are estopped from claiming the strip, and therefore the royalty interest, as against the Durfee Mineral Company.

January 19, last, the conflicting claims were referred to a special master with directions to take the evidence and report the same with findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for a decree. 267 U. S. —, par. 8. The master made his report with findings, conclusions and recommendations favorable to the claim

of Roberts and Britain; the Durfee Mineral Company excepted; and both claimants have been heard in briefs and oral argument on the report and exceptions.

The master found that the Powell survey fronted on the river and had the south bank as its northerly boundary. In the exceptions it is insisted that this finding rests on an erroneous interpretation of the survey. For reasons which will be explained, we think it rests on a right interpretation.

The Powell was one of five surveys made by the same surveyor on the same day—May 8, 1861. These surveys were contiguous and were in the form required of surveys fronting on a stream like Red River.[1] They were also so tied together that the interpretation of one involves an examination of the others.

The surveyor began with the easterly one and proceeded westerly until he had finished all five. His field notes described all as "on the south bank of Red River," and the drawings or plats accompanying the field notes represented all as fronting on the river and having its irregular line as a northerly boundary. The field notes of all, excepting the Powell, also described the northerly line as beginning at the northwest corner of the adjoining survey on the east and running "thence up the river with its meanders" in a stated direction a given distance to a stake or mound "in the bottom" or "on the bluff" at the other end. The Powell was the fourth survey in the line, and so was between others the field notes of which said "thence up the river with its meanders." The field notes of the Powell transmitted to the state land office, and on which the patent issued, were like the others, save that they said "thence up the river" and omitted "with its meanders." But the field notes entered in the appropriate local records said "thence up the river with its meanders." Doubtless the discrepancy resulted from a clerical error in preparing the duplicate sent to the state land office.

We put aside the question of the effect to be given to the entry in the local records; for the phrase "thence up the river" in the field notes sent to the state land office and in the patent evidently mean up the natural course of the river. *Schnackenberg* v. *State*, 229 S. W. 934, 937; *Stover* v. *Gilbert*, 247 S. W. 841, 843; *Brown* v. *Huger*, 21 How. 305, 320. Of course, that phrase must be read with the declaration that the survey was on the south bank

[1] Vernon's Sayles' Civ. Stat. secs. 7008, 7030.

of the river and in the light of the drawing or plat representing the river as the northern boundary.

We think it apparent that the survey was intended to call, and did call, for the river as a boundary and that controlling influence must be given to that call rather than to the course and distance given for that boundary. The courts of Texas, in common with other courts, recognize and apply this rule of interpretation. *Anderson* v. *Stamps*, 19 Tex. 460, 465-466; *Stafford* v. *King*, 30 Tex. 257, 271-272; *Schnackenberg* v. *State*, *supra*; *Stover* v. *Gilbert*, *supra*, and cases there cited; *Cordell Petroleum Co.* v. *Michna*, 276 Fed. 483. The evidence, as pointed out by the master, does not admit of the conclusion that the surveyor mistook a bayou or other body of water for the river, or that the river was not in immediate proximity to the upper corners of the survey when it was made (see *United States* v. *Lane*, 260 U. S. 662); so authorities rejecting an obviously mistaken call for a river or lake are not in point. See *Jeems Bayou Fishing and Hunting Club* v. *United States*, 260 U. S. 561.

The master next found that the land lying between the south bank as now existing and that bank as existing at the time of the Powell survey is accretion to the bank, and therefore part of the Powell tract. Exception is taken to this finding on grounds that are not made very clear. A short statement of what the evidence tends to show in this connection will make it plain that the exception must be overruled. During the 25-year period intervening between the Powell survey and the Durfee survey there was a large addition to the south bank, but in later years most of that addition was cut away. At present the bank extends a little farther northward than it did when the Powell survey was made. These changes all resulted from the natural and gradual processes of accretion and erosion, which are rather pronounced in Red River. Its currents and channels shift from one side of its wide bed to the other, gradually cut away one bank and build up the other, and later on reverse that action. Where, as here, a boundary bank is changed by these processes the boundary, whether private or public, follows the change. *Oklahoma* v. *Texas*, 260 U. S. 606, 636; *Oklahoma* v. *Texas*, 265 U. S. 493, 499.

The necessary result of the two findings we have mentioned is that there was no public land between the Powell tract and the

river to which the Durfee survey and patent could give any right.

The next exception is to the master's conclusion that there was no sufficient evidence on which to invoke an estoppel against the assertion by Roberts and Britain of title to the strip in controversy or to the royalty interest arising therefrom.

The grounds on which an estoppel is invoked are that Specht, from whom Roberts acquired the Powell tract, had theretofore made and distributed a plat of that tract, along with others, whereon it was represented as not extending to the river bank; that Roberts after getting the title made and distributed a plat with a like representation of the northern boundary; that Roberts pointed out to the Durfee Company and its predecessors as the northern boundary a line running south of the land in dispute; and that, acting upon those plats and Roberts' statement, the Durfee Company and its predecessors purchased the land in dispute from a claimant under the Durfee survey and paid a valuable consideration for it. The evidence bearing on the asserted estoppel is in several respects conflicting. It is fully and fairly reviewed by the master in his report and need not be restated here. The master concluded, and we agree with him, that as a whole the evidence shows that the Durfee Company and its predecessors purchased with full knowledge of the record title, including the surveyor's field notes before described; that the plats made by Specht and Roberts were too vague to have been relied upon as a representation of the nature or location of the northern boundary; that the conveyance from Specht to Roberts, which was part of the record title, described the Powell tract as extending to the meanders of the river; that the Durfee Company and its predecessors in purchasing did not in fact rely upon the Specht and Roberts plats or any statement of Roberts, but upon a report made by their attorneys based on the record title, including the field notes; and that the alleged statement by Roberts to them, if made, was made after they had purchased, gone into possession and paid the purchase price. In this situation the asserted estoppel must fail. Only where conduct or statements are calculated to mislead a party and are acted upon by him in good faith to his prejudice can he invoke them as a basis of such an estoppel. And if they relate to the title of real property "where the condition of the title is known to both parties, or both have the same means of ascertaining the truth, there can be no estoppel." *Brant* v. *Virginia Coal*

& Iron Co., 93 U. S. 326, 336-337; *Crary* v. *Dye*, 208 U. S. 515, 521; *Westbrook* v. *Guderian*, 3 Tex. Civ. App. 406; *Hunter* v. *Malone*, 49 Tex. Civ. App. 116, 121; *Bender* v. *Brooks*, 130 S. W. 653, 657; *Barclay* v. *Dismuke*, 202 S. W. 364, 365; Pomeroy's Eq., 4th ed., sec. 807. There was no laches on Roberts' part in asserting his claim after the company purchased. He soon went to the land with a surveyor to run out his lines and make his claim known, but was prevented from doing so by an armed guard. With reasonable promptness he brought a suit in a court of competent jurisdiction to enforce his rights. Proceedings in that suit were soon suspended by reason of this receivership, and he promptly asserted his claim here.

An order will be entered overruling the exceptions, confirming the master's report and directing payment of the royalty interest to Roberts and Britain. The costs will be adjusted in the order.

Claim of Roberts and Britain sustained.
Claim of Durfee Mineral Company denied.

A true copy.

Test:

Clerk, Supreme Court, U. S.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 13, Original.—October Term, 1924.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

[May 11, 1925.]

On consideration of the fourteenth report of the receiver it is ordered:

1. The accounts, disbursements and transactions of the receiver shown in the report are approved;

2. The receiver is directed to apply to receivership expenses the balance of approximately $6,800.00 remaining in his hands to the credit of the river-bed wells;

3. The receiver is directed to pay to the several claimants interested in the Texas or flood-plain wells the balance remaining in his hands to the credit of such wells and heretofore reserved to meet possible receivership expenses;

4. The receiver is instructed, as soon as may be convenient, to make any needful preparation for promptly closing the receivership; to store the books of account, records and files of the receivership with the Security Storage Company of Washington, D. C., in such manner as will make them readily accessible to the clerk of this Court; to pay the storage charges thereon in advance for a period of three years; to deliver such books, records and files as so stored to the clerk of this court; and to make and submit a final report covering his disbursements and transactions since the fourteenth report.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 13, Original.—October Term, 1924.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

[May 11, 1925.]

On consideration of the report made by Joseph M. Hill, Esquire, as special master, under paragraph 8 of the order of January 19, last, and of the exceptions of the Durfee Mineral Company to such report, it is ordered:

1. The exceptions are overruled and the report is confirmed;

2. The claim of T. P. Roberts and A. H. Britain to the royalty interest in the impounded proceeds of the oil and gas taken from receiver's wells 152, 153 and 154 is sustained and the claim of the Durfee Mineral Company to such royalty interest is denied;

3. The receiver is directed to pay out of such royalty interest the following costs incurred in the determination of these claims: To Joseph M. Hill, $2,250.00 for services as special master and $223.36 for expenses; and to the clerk of this court the clerk's costs and printing charges in so far as they may exceed the advance payments made by Roberts and Britain and the Durfee Mineral Company under paragraph 8 of the order of January 19, last;

4. The net balance of such royalty interest remaining after making the required deduction for receivership expenses and paying the costs named in paragraph 3 of this order shall be paid by the receiver to Roberts and Britain as the rightful claimants;

5. No allowance shall be made to either Roberts and Britain or the Durfee Mineral Company by way of reimbursement for expenses incurred and paid in producing witnesses before the special master and having the evidence reported;

6. All moneys advanced for costs under paragraph 8 of the order of January 19, last, by claimants other than Roberts and Britain and the Durfee Mineral Company shall be refunded to such claimants by the clerk. If the advance payments which were made by Roberts and Britain and the Durfee Mineral Company exceed the clerk's costs and printing charges, the excess shall be returned to them in equal proportions.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Colorado,
Appellant,
234. vs.
Roger W. Toll, Superintendent of the Rocky Mountain National Park.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southern Utilities Company,
Petitioner,
339. vs.
The City of Palatka.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error,
352. vs.
A. P. Wooldridge, Receiver of the National Bank of Cleburne.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
Adelaide H. C. Frick, Helen C. Frick, Childs Frick, et al., etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Leonard Metcalf et al., Copartners etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
678. vs.
John J. Mitchell, Former Collector etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant of the State of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
997. vs.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Claude C. Connally, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oklahoma, et al.,
Appellants,
985. vs.
General Construction Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
---.
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, October 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dr. A. W. Boyd, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1075.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket, and advanced for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Mosler Safe Company, Petitioner, vs. Ely-Norris Safe Company. 1143.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Ray Simmons, Petitioner, vs. William R. Fenton, Warden etc. 449.

Walter Ray Simmons, Petitioner, vs. The State of Nebraska. 450.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manuel J. Jacobs, Petitioner, vs. Myra F. Jacobs. 829.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of

counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads etc., Petitioner, 885. vs. Frank Griffith and L.D.Alexander.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Cast Iron Pipe & Foundry Company, Petitioner, 980. vs. M. W. Sullivan, as Administrator.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Parmenter, Petitioner, 986. vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Baker, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
987. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Corrigan, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
988. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Quick, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
989. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Price et al., Petitioners, | On petition for writ of certiorari
1027. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Fox, Petitioner,
1035. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Marcus et al., Individually and as Copartners etc.,
Petitioners,
1049. vs.
Pillsbury Flour Mills Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Porter Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1071. vs.
Java Cocoanut Oil Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Byron A. Corey, Petitioner,
1072. vs.
Sunburst Oil & Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Western Automobile Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1076. vs.
George S. Robbins et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie L. Bellamy, Petitioner,
1088. vs.
Willie G. Pitts et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Mandel et al., Petitioners,
1151. vs.
The United States of America to the use of Wharton & Northern Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from today until Monday, May 25th; from that day until Monday, June 1st; and from June 1st to Monday, June 8th, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

No petitions for writs of certiorari will be received after Monday, May 25th, and no motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, June 1st.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
960. vs.
James Daugherty.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
1164. vs.
Herbert H. McGovern, Jr.,

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by

Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1165. vs.
The Mechanics Securities Corporation.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1167. vs.
Securities Corporation General.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1169. vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
1171. vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.
Thomas Woodnutt Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
1173. vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1175. vs.
American National Bank of St.Paul.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1177. vs.
Henry G. Hilken.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1179. vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1181. vs.
Anna Thalmann.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1183. vs.
Republic Trading Company.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1185. vs.
Jacob Kaufman.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1187. vs.
August Heckscher.

The retirement of Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, was suggested; and Frederick C. Hicks, present Alien Property Custodian, was ordered substituted as a party appellant herein, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1165. vs.
The Mechanics Securities Corporation.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1166. vs.
Securities Corporation General.
Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1167. vs.
Securities Corporation General.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1168. vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee in Bankruptcy.
Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1169. vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee in Bankruptcy.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1170. vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
1171. vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1172. vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.
Thomas Woodnutt Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
1173. vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1174. vs.
American National Bank of St.Paul.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1175. vs.
American National Bank of St.Paul.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1176. vs.
Henry G. Hilken.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1177. vs.
Henry G. Hilken.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1178. vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1179. vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.
The United States, Appellant,
1180. vs.
Anna Thalmann.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1181. vs.
Anna Thalmann.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1182. vs.

The joint motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants, and by Mr. C. C. Carlin, Mr. M. Carter Hall, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the appellees.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1183. vs.
Republic Trading Company.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1184. vs.
Jacob Kaufman.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1185. vs.
Jacob Kaufman.
The United States of America, Appellant,
1186. vs.
August Heckscher.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,
1187. vs.
August Heckscher.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
1084. vs.
Pacific States Paper Trade Association, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. H. Fuller for the petitioner.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second New York District, Petitioner,
1098. vs.
Chile Copper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine and Mr. George E. Cleary for the respondent.

Lois P. Myers, Administratrix of the Estate of Frank S. Myers, deceased, Appellant,
77. vs.
The United States.

Leave was granted to file printed oral arguments of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States, and of Mr. George Wharton Pepper as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Appellant,
1157. vs.
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellant.

First National Bank of Longview, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Henry Jackson. 909.

Leave was granted to submit the petition for a writ of certiorari herein; and the petition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson in behalf of Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

W. Garland Grace et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1120.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the petitioners.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants, vs. The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary. 583.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants, vs. Hill Military Academy. 584.

The motion for leave to file the brief of Public School Defense League of the State of Michigan, herein, as amicus curiae, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George William Moore in that behalf; and the motion was denied.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Harry P. Stitt. 1051.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Sharp for the petitioner, and by Mr. Washington E. Hudson for the respondent.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. Catherine H. Bauer. 1094.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Stephens and Mr. Robert L. Williams for the petitioner.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner, vs. W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Walker Grain Company. 1095.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner,
1096. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.

Alexander Cummings, Petitioner,
1099. vs.
Wilson & Willard Manufacturing Company and E. C. Wilson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard S. Lyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. G. Benton Wilson and Mr. Ford W. Harris for the respondent.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner,
1108. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.

Massachusetts Bonding and Insurance Company et al., Petitioners,
1109. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee of the Estate of Walker Grain Company, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.

Guaranty Bank & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
1154. vs.
Texas Sulphur Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. James Daugherty. 960.

The motion for bond and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Daugherty, pro se.

George Cox, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Florida. 1155.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Bell for the plaintiff in error.

Walker Bryant, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Florida. 1156.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Bell for the plaintiff in error.

R. O. Bass, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Clifton. 1089.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Andres Feuntes, Petitioner, vs. The Director of Prisons. 927.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

It appearing to the Court that the petitioner herein has failed to prosecute his petition for a writ of certiorari within the time prescribed by Section 4 of Rule 37,

Therefore, on consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Humble Oil & Refining Company et al., Petitioners, vs. K. Kishi et al. 970.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that the petitioner herein has failed

to prosecute his petition for a writ of certiorari within the time prescribed by Section 4 of Rule 37,

Therefore, on consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 25th, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Robert E. Lynch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene W. Burr, It is ordered that John W. Bennett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stuart Lewis, It is ordered that Hugh S. Craig, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that J. Vaughan Gary, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Finerty, It is ordered that S. C. Rowe, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hammers, It is ordered that P. Robert G. Sjostrom, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Irwin Ira Rackoff, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. I. F. Goldenhorn, It is ordered that Isidore Hornstein, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that George B. Vest, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that Thomas Brown, Esquire, of Perth Amboy, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Joseph Conrad Fehr, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Hutchins, It is ordered that L. Earl Curry, Esquire, of Miami, State of

Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that Peyton E. Brown, Esquire, of Blackwell, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Sam T. Allen, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Wilmutt Ameli, It is ordered that Charles F. Murphy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Norman B. Landreau, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jose Moreno, It is ordered that David Fernandez Lavadia, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Wesley Martin, Esquire, of Webster City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that R. J. F. McElroy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that Henry Ravenel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Lemuel L. Bolles, Esquire, of Seattle, Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. I. F. Goldenhorn, It is ordered that Alexander Raskin, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, It is ordered that J. D. Barksdale, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, It is ordered that Howard B. Warren, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Houghton, It is ordered that Ellis W. Leavenworth, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., It is ordered that Robert E. Coulson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Vance, Jr., It is ordered that H. Church Ford, Esquire, of Georgetown, State

of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Domenico Dumbra and Fortunato Chiapparone,
Plaintiffs in Error,
546. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Vincent L. Knewel, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

On consideration of the motion to substitute the present Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota, George Boardman, as the party appellant herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

George Boardman, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this appeal,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Pet Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Boardman, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota,
Appellant,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to remand the appellee to the custody of the present Sheriff.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

D. S. Sowell, Plaintiff in Error,
367. vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Texas.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and, was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees,
Petitioners,
363. vs.
Anna F. C. Martin et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
191. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
192. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
193. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that General Order in Bankruptcy No. 8, entitled "Proceedings in Partnership Cases", and Bankruptcy Form No. 2, entitled "Partnership Petition", be, and are, abrogated and annulled.

Order announced by Mr. Justice Sanford.

Hidemitsu Toyota
251. vs.
The United States of America.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Butler.
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York, State of New York, and Transit Commission, State of New York, Appellants,
465. vs.
Belt Line Railway Corporation.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
768. vs.
Walter S. Dickey and Ralph Ellis.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Baltimore Post. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

847.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States ex rel. F. C. Ruts, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, United States Marshal in and for the Northern District of Illinois. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

935.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States ex rel. H. H. Fauntleroy, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, United States Marshal in and for the Northern District of Illinois. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

936.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States ex rel. J. F. Steneck, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, United States Marshal in and for the Northern District of Illinois. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

937.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States ex rel. Harry C. Wanner, Appellant, vs. Robert R. Levy, United States Marshal in and for the Northern District of Illinois. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

938.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Elmo R. Royer. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

359.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant,
348. vs.
Levina B. Donaldson.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Wallace Benedict, as Receiver in Bankruptcy of the Hub Carpet Company, Petitioner,
11. vs.
Aaron Ratner.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
329. vs.
Reynolds-Davis Grocery Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles Sherwin and Harry H. Schwarz, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 379. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Ray Consolidated Copper Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 443. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Reuben Weller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. 349. In Error to the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Special Sessions in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc.,
Appellant,
417. vs.
The City of Portland, George L. Baker, Mayor; Frank S. Grant, Attorney, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Cheung Sum Shee, Sheung Wai Mun, Fong Goon Hong, et al.,
769. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Chang Chan, Wong Hung Kay, Yee Sin Jung, et al.
770. vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered as follows:

The applicants should be refused admission if found to be Chinese wives of American citizens.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mariano Viamonte Fernandez,
Appellant,
680. vs.
Perley B. Phillips, Marshal of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent for Claims Due in Operation of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
786. vs.
E. H. Pringle, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Charles F. Boyd Company, Inc., Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent for Claims Due in Operation of Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
787. vs.
E. H. Pringle, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Charles P. Boyd, Inc., Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee, Petitioner,
1085. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and

of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

North Carolina Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
322. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff of Alamance County, North Carolina, and P. M. King, Administrator etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde H. Finley, Receiver, and Coronado Coal Company, Denman Coal Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
671. vs.
United Mine Workers of America, P. H. Stewart, Fred Holt, et al., etc., et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. James Daugherty. 960. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that John Spalding Flannery, Esquire, of Washington, D. C., be, and he is hereby, appointed counsel for the respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. James Daugherty. 960. On consideration of the motion to admit the respondent in this cause to bail, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. James Daugherty. 960. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, and others, vs. The Mechanics Securities Corporation and others. 1165 to 1187. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument, as two cases, on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company. 1157. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is

next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Municipal Assembly of Arroyo, Porto Rico, Petitioner,
369. vs.
Successors of C. & J. Fantauzzi.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion to quash the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, quashed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew G. Patterson et al., Appellants,
774. vs.
Mobile Gas Company.

On suggestion of diminution of the record in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that the papers set out as Exhibits 1 to 14 of appellants' motion be made a part of the record on appeal; provided that the costs involved in complying with the order and with the subsequent printing shall be imposed upon appellants if it be found that this order was unnecessary.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Omar Lenox Macklem, Appellant,
968. vs.
Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On consideration of the motion to admit the appellant herein to bail,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Omar Macklem, Appellant,
968. vs.
Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is

hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Banco di Roma,
Plaintiff in Error,
850. vs.
Philippine National Bank.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. W. Coffee et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
593. vs.
Joseph F. Gray, Receiver of the Tallulah Falls Railway Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,
Petitioner,
413. vs.
Ernest J. Goneau.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and placed on the summary docket for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity National Bank & Trust Company of Kansas City et al., Appellants,
930. vs.
Felix H. Swope et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Cox, Plaintiff in Error,
1155. vs.
The State of Florida.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and on motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction ex mero motu.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker Bryant, Plaintiff in Error,
1156. vs.
The State of Florida.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and on motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction ex mero motu.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
866. vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
1084. vs.
Pacific States Paper Trade Association et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second New York District, Petitioner,
1098. vs.
Chile Copper Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
919. vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General etc.,
Petitioner,
859. vs.
Catherine Lind, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emelie W. Peacock, Appellant,
887. vs.
Mable C. Reinecke, Collector etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Longview,
Plaintiff in Error,
909. vs.
Henry Jackson.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tampico Banking Company, S. A.,
Petitioner,
975. vs.
R. S. Barber.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Little Six Oil Company,
Petitioner,
978. vs.
Marie T. Emerson et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commerce-Guardian Trust & Savings Bank, Petitioner,
1016. vs.
The State of Michigan et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
1051. vs.
Harry F. Stitt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chickasha Cotton Oil Company,
Petitioner,
1056. vs.
Homer M. Chapman et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
1094. vs.
Catherine H. Bauer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner,
1095. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner,
1096. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Cummings, Petitioner,
1099. vs.
Wilson & Willard Manufacturing Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Walker, Petitioner,
1108. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Massachusetts Bonding & Insurance Company et al., Petitioners,
1109. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Garland Grace et al., Petitioners,
1120. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guaranty Bank & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
1154. vs.
Texas Sulphur Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
19, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The motion that the printing of the record herein be directed, and that the cause be set for argument, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the complainant.

The United States, Appellant,
1133. vs.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1134. vs.
Central New England Railway Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1135. vs.
New England Steamship Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1257. vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1158. vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for The United States.

The United States, Appellant,
1136. vs.
The Reading Company.
The Reading Company, Appellant,
1137. vs.
The United States.
The United States, Appellant,
1138. vs.
Southern Railway Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1139. vs.
The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company.

The motions to advance and set these cases for argument with No. 292 were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for The United States, and by Mr. L. T. Michener for the appellee in No. 1136 and the appellant in No. 1137.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
1249. vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., et al., Executors.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
1145. vs.
Western Meat Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. W. H. Fuller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan for the respondent.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector,
Petitioner,
1203. vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. John O. H. Pitney for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1224. vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile No. 4776501, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file a reply on or before Thursday next.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1261. vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eldon Bisbee and Mr. Bertram F. Shipman for the respondent.

The United States, Appellant,
1161. vs.
The Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Henderson in that behalf.

Royal Mineral Association et al.,
Appellants,
1121. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Merrimac Mining Company,
Appellant,
1124. vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines et al., Appellants,
1025. vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.
George L. Burrows, Jr., et al., etc., Appellants,
1060. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Helen P. Bardwell et al.,
Appellants,
1220. vs.
Sargent Land Company et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Newton in behalf of Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, Mr. G. A. Youngquist, and Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the appellees.

Acme Foundry & Machine Company,
Petitioner,
1194. vs.
The Oil Well Improvements Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Ray Dean and Mr. Luther Ely Smith for the petitioner.

Beatrice J. Weston et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
775. vs.
The City of Tulsa et al.

The statement of points to be relied upon and motion to overrule designation of defendants in error as to printing record herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Louis W. Pratt and Mr. James M. Springer for the plaintiffs in error in support

of the motion, and by Mr. R. C. Allen, Mr. I. J. Underwood, and Mr. H. D. Bland for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

First National Bank of Longview, Plaintiff in Error,
909. vs.
Henry Jackson.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. H. E. Taylor for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company et al., Appellants,
982. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Harry C. Howard for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Blackburn Esterline, and Mr. J. P. Farrell for the appellees.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant,
285. vs.
The United States.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Charles H. Bates for the appellant.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al., Appellants,
195. vs.
A. Sardell.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of California.

Philip Leschnik, Petitioner,
1255. vs.
Catherine C. Frier, as Trustee of the Estate in Bankruptcy of Sol J. Leschnik.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the petitioner, and by Mrs. Catherine C. Frier, pro se.

The National Shawmut Bank of Boston, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Boston. 1004.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock and Mr. John A. Sullivan for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert H. Holt for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al., Petitioners, vs. Benjamin Guinness. 420.

Benjamin Guinness et al., Petitioners, vs. Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al. 421.

Frederick C. Hicks, present Alien Property Custodian, was substituted as a party petitioner in No. 420, and as a party respondent in No. 421, in place of Thomas W. Miller, resigned, on motion of Mr. Leslie C. Garnett in that behalf.

George Chaprales, Appellant, vs. W. I. Biddle, Warden etc. 1201.

The motion to advance this cause and admit the appellant herein to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert S. Marley for the appellant; with leave to Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee to reply thereto on or before Thursday next.

Terrence Druggan, Appellant, vs. Palmer E. Anderson, United States Marshal, et al. 1151.

The motion to admit the appellant herein to bail pending appeal, or, in the alternative, to advance this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael J. Ahearn and Mr. Thomas D. Nash for the appellant.

Lazarus G. Joseph et al., Petitioners, vs. John Bordman et al. 1193.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and the motion for supersedeas, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Green and Mr. John W. Clifton for the petitioners.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener. 13, Orig.

The final Report of the Receiver was received and filed, on motion of Mr. John Spalding Flannery in that behalf.

The United States, Appellant,
1138. vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. J. Harry Covington and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
1139. vs.
St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company.

The motion to advance and set this cause for argument with No. 292 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake and Mr. Alexander Britton for the appellee.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
1254. vs.
New York and Queens Gas Company.

Mr. Robert E. Coulson, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"District Court of the United States,
for the Southern District of New York:

I, Alexander Gilchrist, Jr., Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, do hereby certify:

That, in a certain cause pending in the said Court, Equity No. 26-367, wherein the New York and Queens Gas Company was plaintiff, and William A. Prendergast, William R. Pooley, Charles Van Voorhis, Oliver C. Semple and James A. Parsons, constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, and Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, were defendants, a final decree, dated the 10th day of July, 1924, and signed by the Honorable Francis A. Winslow, U. S. D. J., was duly rendered, in favor of the said plaintiff, and against the said defendants, wherein and whereby, among other things, a certain maximum rate of $1.00 per thousand cubic feet of gas sold by the plaintiff, and $1.15 per thousand cubic feet of gas sold by the plaintiff, and a certain standard of gas of not less than 650 British thermal units per cubic foot, and certain provisions of Chapters 898 and 899 of the Laws of 1923 of the State of New York, relative to such rates and such standards of gas, were adjudged and decreed to be illegal and void, because in contravention of Section 10 of Article I, and of the Fourteenth Amendment, of the Constitution of the United States, and wherein and whereby the said defendants were enjoined, among other things, from enforcing the said rates and standard of gas and the said provisions of the said statutes, all as more fully appears in the

said final decree, a copy of which is hereto annexed, marked "Schedule A".

That on the 9th day of October, 1924, the said Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, filed herein a petition dated October 7th, 1924, for leave to appeal from the said final decree rendered on the 11th day of July, 1924, for the reasons set forth in an Assignment of Error therewith filed;

That, on the 9th day of October, 1924, the said appeal was duly allowed by Honorable Francis A. Winslow, U. S. D. J.

That on the 9th day of October, 1924, an order was duly entered herein serving the defendants William A. Prendergast, William R. Pooley, Charles Van Voorhis, Oliver C. Semple and James A. Parsons, constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, as parties to the said action and for the purpose of the appeal so taken from the said final decree;

That on the 9th day of October, 1924, a citation on the said appeal was duly issued out of the said District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York to the New York and Queens Gas Company, returnable at a Term of the Supreme Court of the United States to be held in the City of Washington, D. C., on the 8th day of November, 1924;

That on the 20th day of October, 1924, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause extending the time for the appellant to file a transcript of the record to November 18, 1924;

That on the 14th day of November, 1924, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause extending the time of the appellant to file a transcript of the record to December 31, 1924;

That on the 27th day of December, 1924, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause extending the time of the appellant to file the transcript of the record to January 9, 1925; and there has been no further extension;

That on January 9, 1925, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause substituting George R. Van Namee in place of James A. Parsons as party defendant, and substituting Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, in place of Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, as party defendant;

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the said District Court, at the City of New York, in the

State of New York, this 21st day of May, in the year of our Lord One thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the said United States the One hundred and Forty-ninth.
(SEAL). (Signed) ALEX. GILCHRIST, JR., Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court.

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
1119. vs.
Viola Massey, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, of the State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in behalf of Mr. William H. Devlin and Mr. Robert T. Devlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis Carr for the respondent.

Robert T. Brown, Jr., Petitioner,
1079. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Erle Pettus and Mr. James A. Cobb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

American Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Corporation, Claimant of the Barge "Amsadoc", etc., et al., Petitioners,
1111. vs.
John Rourke & Sons.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Cann for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. A. Lawrence for the respondent.

W. H. L. Newingham et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1115.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard B. McGinnis for the petitioners.

Charles Schopp, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1118.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander S. Drescher for the petitioner.

William Van Engelen, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1128.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Moore for the petitioner.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. International Bridge Company, Petitioner, vs. State Tax Commission. 1147.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adelbert Moot and Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger and Mr. Frederic C. Rupp for the respondent.

S. C. Grigsby et al., Administrators, Petitioners, vs. The Southern Railway Company. 1152.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Kennerly for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles H. Smith, for the respondent.

S. J. Craig, Petitioner, vs. W. S. Langmade, as Executor etc., et al. 1158.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Stark for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. O. Caster for the respondent.

James Duigman, Appellant,
1163. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

Edgar F. Hiatt, Petitioner,
1188. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Noel for the petitioner.

Marion E. Marks, Petitioner,
1189. vs.
Carl Bauers et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. I. Moulton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elton Watkins for the respondent.

John Carlton Dysart, Petitioner,
1190. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Morrow and Mr. J. H. Hutchins for the petitioner.

Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1192. vs.
F. A. Cooke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Burch, Mr. Harry McCall, Mr. Victor Leovy, and Mr. H. D. Minor for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederick H. Lotterhos and Mr. George Butler for the respondents.

Leo A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1199. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

James Scott, Plaintiff in Error,
1200. vs.
Morris National Bank of Morris.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Harman W. McMahon, Petitioner,
1208. vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. D. Scully for the petitioner, and by Mr. Don Rose for the respondent.

Hartford Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1211. vs.
Wilson & Toomer Fertilizer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel MacDougald and Mr. E. M. Underwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Bedell for the respondent.

General Baking Company, Petitioner,
1212. vs.
James H. Gorman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis W. Leavenworth, Mr. Julius M. Mayer, and Mr. F. P. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel C. O'Donoghue for the respondent.

State Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
1218. vs.
T. J. Gilbreath.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. H. Grisham and Mr. J. S. Grisham for the respondent.

Mrs. Vannye Gilmer, Administratrix etc.,
Petitioner,
1222. vs.
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lomax M. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Burch, Mr. H. D. Minor, and Mr. Marion G. Evans for the respondent.

Vapor Car Heating Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Gold Car Heating & Lighting Company et al. 1223. The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Raymond Barnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Redding and Mr. Arthur C. Fraser for the respondents.

Joseph DiCarlo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1226. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas L. Newton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Joseph Ruffino, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1227. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest W. McIntyre and Mr. Thomas L. Newton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. F. S. Royster Guano Company. 1230. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton and Mr. Kenneth E. Stockton for the petitioner.

Union Petroleum Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. William H. Edwards, Formerly Collector etc. 1231. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

I. A. Silverberg et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 1237. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Weeks for the appellants in support of the petition.

Washburn Crosby Company, Petitioner, vs. France Milling Company. 1245. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. Harry D. Nims, and Mr. Minturn DeS. Verdi for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Darby for the respondent.

Frank E. Stripe et al., Receivers, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1252. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the petitioners.

Samuel A. Myers et al., Petitioners, vs. International Trust Company. 1256. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioner, and by Mr. John R. Lazenby for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 1st next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Isidore Hershfield, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Connaughton, It is ordered that William F. Zumbrunn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Connaughton, It is ordered that Ben H. Sullivan, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Steward, It is ordered that Frank Hall Stephens, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Flannery, It is ordered that Raymond G. Koenig, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that John H. Wootton, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Henry Simms, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Lewis A. Staker, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Manuel A. Alzate, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene W. Burr, It is ordered that Henry A. Cox, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Cullen, It is ordered that Joseph A. Cantrel,, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. I. Brown, It is ordered that J. Forrest Reilly, Esquire, of Washington, Dis-

trict of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Charles Leviton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Joseph G. Slottow, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that John E. Marshall, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that Wright Clark, Esquire, of Red Oak, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, It is ordered that Franklin D. Adams, Esquire, of Miami, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that William A. Moore, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. H. Long, It is ordered that E. Lee Noble, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. H. Long, It is ordered that Frank J. Sloan, Esquire, of Mt. Rainier, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that Walter H. Buck, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that James Morfit Mullen, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Moses J. Konnoson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Max Rhoade, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Ray Van Cott, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Second Russian Insurance Company,

Appellant,

362. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al.,
Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sanford,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Cement Manufacturers Protective Association et al.,
Appellants,
551. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sanford,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
40. vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
236. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Butler.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Joshua W. Miler, Formerly United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland,
Plaintiff in Error,
53. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants,
583. vs.
The Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Walter M. Pierce, as Governor of the State of Oregon, et al., Appellants,
584. vs.
Hill Military Academy.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

On consideration of the final Report of the Receiver, presented a week ago, It is ordered that the accounts, disbursements, and transactions of the Receiver shown in the Report be approved.

And it appearing that all of the property and moneys which came into the possession of the Receiver have been disposed of, disbursed, and paid out in compliance with the instructions and orders of the Court; that all of the expenses of the Receivership have been paid; that the Receiver has stored the books of account, records, and files of the Receivership with the Security Storage Company of Washington, D. C., and has delivered the same as stored to the Clerk of the Court, as directed in the order of May 11th last; and that the Receivership has served its purpose and is now ready to be closed:

It is considered, ordered, and decreed that the Receivership in this cause be, and it now is declared at an end, and that the Receiver be, and he now is, relieved and discharged from further duty, obligation and responsibility in the premises.

In terminating the Receivership, the Court expresses its high appreciation of the admirable service of the Receiver in satisfactorily managing a large estate in novel and difficult circumstances.

Order announced by Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
122.& 123.vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
124 & 125.vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
123. vs. In Error to the Supreme Court
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court
124. vs. of the State of Pennsylvania.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., as Executors etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
125. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Juan Perez Cami, Municipal Commissioner of Finance, Petitioner,
370. vs.
Central Victoria, Limitted.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Meyer Selzman, Plaintiff in Error,
998. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States, Appellant,
1133. vs.
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1134. vs.
Central New England Railway Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1135. vs.
The New England Steamship Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1257. vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1258. vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1136. vs.
Reading Company.
Reading Company, Appellant,
1137. vs.
The United States.
The United States, Appellant,
1138. vs.
Southern Railway Company.
The United States, Appellant,
1139. vs.
The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases to be heard with No. 292, as two cases only, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
1249. vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., et al., Executors etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
1161. vs.
The Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument after No. 1026, on Monday, November 2d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Mineral Association et al., Appellants,
1121. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Merrimac Mining Company, Appellant,
1124. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines et al., Appellants,
1025. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
George L. Burrows, Jr., et al., Appellants,
1060. vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Helen P. Bardwell et al., Appellants,
1220. vs.
Sargent Land Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument, as four cases, on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. O. Bass, Plaintiff in Error,
1089. vs.
The City of Clifton.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Tenth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Tenth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Longview, Plaintiff in Error,
909. vs.
Henry Jackson.

In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The National Shawmut Bank of Boston, Plaintiff in Error,
1004. vs.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant,
19, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to print the record in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beatrice J. Weston et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
775. vs.
The City of Tulsa et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the plaintiffs in error herein be permitted to print the matter designated, provided that they be confined to the questions properly covered by the parts of the record printed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company et al., Appellants,
982. vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the appellants herein be permitted to print the matter they will designate as enough for their purpose and to confer with counsel for the United States to agree if possible upon a short statement showing the scope of the whole evidence to enable the Court to consider the issue whether there is any evidence supporting the finding of the commission.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Terrence Druggan, Appellant,
1151. vs.
Palmer E. Anderson, United States Marshal etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to admit the appellant herein to bail, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced, and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
1145. vs.
Western Meat Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company et al., Petitioners,
1192. vs.
F. A. Cooke.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lazarus G. Joseph et al., Petitioners,
1193. vs.
John Bordman et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leo A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
1199. vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
1203. vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harman W. McMahon, Petitioner,
1208. vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank E. Stripe et al., as Receivers in Equity of Johnson Shipyards Corporation, Petitioners,
1252. vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel A. Myers, Copartners as S. A. and H. Myers, Petitioners,
1256. vs.
International Trust Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
1261. vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
1224. vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile, No. 4,776,501, Alabama License No. 10978, Garth Motor Company, Claimant.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on the summary docket on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert T. Brown, Jr., Petitioner,
1079. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Shipbuilding & Dock Corporation, Claimant of the Barge "Amsodoc", etc., et al., Petitioners,
1111. vs.
John Rourke & Sons.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. H. L. Newingham et al., Petitioners,
1115. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Schopp, Petitioner,
1118. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Peti

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
1119. vs.
Viola Massey, as Administratrix of the Estate of Arthur Ralph Massey, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Van Engelen, Petitioner,
1128. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. International Bridge Company,
Petitioner,
1147. vs.
State Tax Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. C. Grigsby et al., Administrators of R.L.Grigsby, deceased,
Petitioners,
1152. vs.
The Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. J. Craig, Petitioner, vs. W. S. Langmade, as Executor etc., et al. — 1158. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar P. Hiatt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — 1188. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marion E. Marks, Petitioner, vs. Carl Bauers et al., etc. — 1189. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Acme Foundry & Machine Company,
Petitioner,
1194. vs.
The Oil Well Improvements Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
1211. vs.
Wilson & Toomer Fertilizer Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Baking Company,
Petitioner,
1212. vs.
James H. Gorman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

States Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
1218. vs.
T. J. Gilbreath.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Vannye Gilmer, Administratrix etc., Petitioner, vs. Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company. 1222. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vapor Car Heating Company, Inc., et al., Appellants, vs. Gold Car Heating & Lighting Company et al. 1223. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph DiCarlo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1226. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Ruffino, Petitioner,
1227. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Petroleum Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
1231. vs.
William H. Edwards, Formerly Collector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. A. Silverberg et al.,
Petitioners,
1237. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Washburn Crosby Company, Petitioner,
1245. vs.
France Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philip Leschnik, Petitioner,
1253. vs.
Catherine C. Prier, Trustee of the Estate in Bankruptcy of Sol J. Leschnik.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. H. Davis et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
992. vs.
Alice Williford et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Duignan, Appellant,
1163. vs.
The United States of America et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the samd is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
1270. vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant.

Merriam & Millard Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
430. vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Bynon

Clark, Mr. Bruce Scott, and Mr. Kenneth F. Burgess for the defendant in error in support of the motion; with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a reply on or before Saturday next.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant,
348. vs.
Lavina B. Donaldson.

Leave was granted to withdraw the appearance of Mr. Alfred Lucking as counsel for the appellant herein, on motion of Mr. E. W. Bradford in that behalf.

Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District, Appellant,
135. vs.
J. B. Bond, Project Manager etc., et al.

Leave was granted to present a petition for a rehearing within ten days from the adjournment of the present term, on motion of Mr. Will R. King for the appellant.

The State of Missouri at the relation and to the use of Wabash Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
1078. vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

The motion for leave to submit the motion to advance this cause was denied, for want of proper notice.

Henry F. duPont, Plaintiff in Error,
686. vs.
Cornelius R. Miller, as Director of Public Works and Buildings, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde L. Day, Mr. Edward J. Brundage, Mr. Ednyfed H. Williams, and Mr. Rufus F. Robinson for Cornelius R. Miller, as Director of Public Works and Buildings, a defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Angus Roy Shannon for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Western Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
287. vs.
The United States.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. George Francis Williams for the appellant.

D. B. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection of the Department of Labor and Industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Appellant,
1268. vs.
The Palmer Brothers Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf.

Lazarus G. Joseph et al.,
Petitioners,
1193. vs.
John Bordman et al.

The motion for supersedeas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Green for the petitioners.

William Locke Paddon,
Petitioner,
614. vs.
Una Margaret Locke Paddon.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that the petitioner herein has failed to prosecute his petition for a writ of certiorari within the time prescribed by Section 4 of Rule 37,

Therefore, on consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 8th, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1925.

. Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Franklin Clyde Baggarly, Esquire, of Washington, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, It is ordered that John T. Fowler, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles A. Colton, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Lester B. Barrett, Esquire, of Farmville, State of North Carolina; J. L. Zumwalt, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas; Guy Patten, Esquire, of Vinita, State of Oklahoma; and Leonidas Franklin Summerall, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that Fred Donald Enfield, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of

Nebraska; and H. A. B. Schwartz, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, It is ordered that Mark J. Ryan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, It is ordered that George S. Evans, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, It is ordered that William D. Rockwood, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that George W. Fenimore, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; Miller Hughes, Esquire, of Wickliffe, State of Kentucky; Theodore Cogswell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Sterling Douglas Carr, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California; Robert McKerness Foster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and T. S. Settle, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Woodward, It is ordered that John Hunt Hendrickson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Zumbrunn, It is ordered that Hartson C. McCall, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Philip H. Mecom, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin L. Davis, It is ordered that Milus A. Nisbet, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by ~~Mrs.~~ Emma M. Gillett, It is ordered that Marie Stirlith Ruth, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Emma M. Gillett, It is ordered that Mary L. Dee, of Campbell, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

The Attorney General introduced the Honorable William D. Mitchell, of Minnesota, Solicitor General of the United States; and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

Calvin Coolidge,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know Ye: That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of William D. Mitchell, of Minnesota, I do appoint him Solicitor General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States and to Have and to Hold the said Office with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto Him, the said William D. Mitchell, until the end of the next session of the Senate of the United States, and no longer, subject to the provisions of Law.

In Testimony Whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the Seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this fourth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred twenty-five, and of the Independence of the United State of America the one hundred and forty-ninth.

(Signed) CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

(Signed) John G. Sargent,

Attorney General.

James C. Davis, Agent,

Plaintiff in Error,

331. vs.

L. L. Cohen & Company, Inc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

James C. Davis, Agent,

Plaintiff in Error,

331. vs.

L. L. Cohen & Company, Inc.

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

B. F. Lee et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

336. vs.

Osceola & Little River Road Improvement District No. 1 of Mississippi County, Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

B. F. Lee et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

336. vs.

Osceola & Little River Road Improvement District No. 1 of Mississippi County, Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Rosevale Realty Company, Inc.,

Plaintiff in Error,

350. vs.

Albert E. Kleinert, as Superintendent of the Bureau of Buildings of the Borough of Brooklyn, City of New York, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Benjamin Gitlow,

Plaintiff in Error,

19. vs.

The People of the State of New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

William H. Edwards, Formerly United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
384. vs.
The Cuba Railroad Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

William Danzer & Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
346. vs.
Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

D. B. Robertson, Appellant,
739. vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Court of Customs Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
360. vs.
Daniel Hoge.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

George Chaprales, Appellant,
1201. vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, ex mero motu.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merriam & Millard Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
430. vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis and Hannibal Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
538. vs.
Mary Jackman.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
1270. vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. E. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection in Pittsburgh of the Department of Labor and Industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Appellant,
1268. vs.
The Palmer Brothers Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November

2d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lazarus G. Joseph et al., Petitioners, vs. John Bordman et al. 1193. It is ordered by this Court that the motion for supersedeas herein be, and the same is hereby, granted, provided that the petitioner gives bond in the sum of $3,000 conditioned to cover all damages accruing from the granting of the supersedeas; and also provided that the respondent may vacate the supersedeas on giving bond in the sum of $10,000 in this court conditioned for the payment of the judgment against Behn Meyer & Company in case it shall be held by this court that the petitioner was properly appointed Receiver and was charged with the duty of collecting judgment.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Casualty Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Alfred W. Agee, Administrator. 1024. Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Carlton Dysart, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1190. Order allowing certiorari. The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc. 758. It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
759. vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
1230. vs.
F. S. Royster Guano Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument with No. 268 heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy Ward Stebbins and Frank J. Hurley, as Executrix and Executor etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
227. vs.
Ray L. Riley, Controller of the State of California.

It is ordered by this Court that the opinion heretofore filed be amended by inserting on page 6, line 17, after the word "estate", and before the word "passing", the words, "subject to the jurisdiction of the State and". Also by striking out the same line the last "the" in the line and substituting of
the word "its"; and by striking out of line 18 the words "of the State", so that the sentence as amended will read as follows: "The incidents which attach to each as we have observed, may be made the basis of classification. We can perceive no reason why both may not be made the basis of classification in a single taxing statute so that the amount of tax which the legatee shall pay may be made to depend both on the total net amount of decedent's estate subject to the jurisdiction of the State and passing under its inheritance and testamentary laws and the amount of the legacy to which the legatee succeeds under those laws."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,
345. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, Director of

It is ordered by this Court that the opinion heretofore filed be amended by inserting on page 4, line 4, after the

word "which" the words "may be deemed equivalent to a legislative declaration that", and that in line 5 of the words "declared that" be stricken out so that the sentence as amended will read as follows: "The vice of the legislation is dramatically exposed by the fact that the State of Oregon had issued its certificate which may be deemed equivalent to a legislative declaration that, despite existing facilities, public convenience and necessity require the establishment by Buck of the auto stage line between Seattle and Portland."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Boardman, as Sheriff of Minnehaha County, South Dakota, Appellants,
622. vs.
George W. Egan.

Upon telegraphic application of George W. Egan, he is given permission to present a petition for rehearing in the case of Boardman, Sheriff, vs. Egan, No. 622, decided May 25, on or before the 18th of June, as if filed today, but this order is on the condition that such filing shall not delay the immediate going down of the mandate from this Court or the prompt execution of the judgment of conviction against Egan in the State Courts of South Dakota which this proceeding in habeas corpus stayed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The court announced that the original docket, made up of cases begun under the original jurisdiction of this court, will be called on the first day of the next term, with the purpose of eliminating cases which are not prosecuted with reasonable diligence and of making any necessary orders respecting the continued prosecution of others.

The court announced a revision of its rules, lodged printed copies thereof with the clerk, and ordered that these revised rules shall take effect and become operative July 1st, 1925.

Order. In the cases in which opinions have been handed down today, ten days shall elapse before the mandates go down; and leave is given to the parties to file such motions within that period as they may be advised, which shall have the same effect as if filed this day.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al., Appellants,
342. vs.
The United States of America.

A. Wheat for the appellee.

The motion to extend the time within which to present a petition for rehearing to thirty days from this date was granted, on motion of Mr. Alfred

Cement Manufacturers' Protective Association et al., Appellants,
551. vs.
The United States of America.

A. Wheat for the appellee.

The motion to extend the time within which to present a petition for rehearing to thirty days from this date was granted, on motion of Mr. Alfred

William H. Edwards, Formerly Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,
324. vs.
The Cuba Railroad Company.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
653. vs.
O. B. Fish.

D. B. Robertson, Appellant,
739. vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

The motion to extend the time within which to present a petition for rehearing in these cases to thirty days from this date was granted, on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in that behalf.

A. L. May, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
126. vs.
J. M. Henderson, Jr., et al.

Leave was granted to present a petition for rehearing within ten days from this date, on motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf.

Samuel A. Myers et al., etc., Petitioners,
1256. vs.
International Trust Company.

Leave was granted to present a petition for rehearing of the order granting the writ of certiorari herein, within ten days, on motion of Mr. Andrew Wilson in behalf of Mr. John R. Lazenby for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
111. vs.
James J. Johnston.

The motion to extend the time within which to present a petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F.

Finerty in behalf of counsel; and the motion was denied.

The Facer Forged Steel Car Wheel and Locomotive Wheel Company,	The motion for a rule on the clerk to file certain papers was submitted to
937, Petitioner,	the consideration of the Court by Mr.
Oct.Term, 1923. vs.	Frank Hall Stephens; and the motion
The Carnegie Steel Company.	was denied.

Order. It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided, and all other business of the Term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next Term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.

VOL

19

UME

25

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1925.

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 5th day of the same month), in the year of our Lord One thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the United States the One hundred and fiftieth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Harrison E. Fryberger, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, It is ordered that Irwin T. Gilruth, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson, It is ordered that Herbert Levy, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence E. Brown, It is ordered that Fred Fite, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Knight, It is ordered that Karl Fenning, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven, It is ordered that John G. Carter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that John T.Diederich, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that John B. Gaines, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Clark, It is ordered that Erskine W. Landis, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., It is ordered that E. A. Lilisoly, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Eulogio P. Revilla, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine

Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Rush Hightower Knox, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Hiram H. Creekmore, Esquire, of Water Valley, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Elmer Clinton Sharp, Esquire, of Booneville, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Carl D. Mosier, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Meredith P. Sawyer, Esquire, of Menominee, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, Jr./ It is ordered that Herbert Knox Smith, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that B. M. Parmenter, Esquire, of Lawton, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that William S. Stoner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Benjamin D. Winner, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph S. Matthews, It is ordered that Jeremy Richard Waldron, Esquire, of Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that Donald C. Thompson, Esquire, of Meadville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Selby, It is ordered that George B. Covington, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that William L. Taggart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, It is ordered that Louis Henry Chalmers, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, It is ordered that J. Thomas Hoffman, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that John H. Riordan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Barton Payne, It is ordered that Hermann J. Hughes, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that William Lux, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the following cases, viz: Nos. 91, 92, 156, 188, 256, 30 (and 477), 258, 249, 208, 224, 31, 273, and 337 (and 420), heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for Monday, November 16th next.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the following cases, viz: Nos. 192, 503, 181, 4, 288 (and 289), 246, 242, 13 Original, and 328, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for Monday, November 23d next.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the following cases, viz: Nos. 183 (and 376), 320, 314, 365, 303, 423 (to 445, inclusive), 417, 76, and 36 (and 398, 399, 400, 499, 500, 401, 402, 403, and 404), heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for Monday, November 30th next.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the following cases, viz: Nos. 493, 388 (and 389, 390, 391, 336, 355, and 471), 512, and 510, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for Monday, December 7th next.

The United States, Complainant,
17, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the complainant.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
77. vs.
Union Electric Light & Power Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and it appearing to the Court that a joint motion of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions to enter:

(1) upon the cause of action set forth in the first count of appellee's petition, a judgment in favor of the appellee, Union Electric Light & Power Company, and against the United States of America in the sum of eight thousand seven hundred twenty-seven dollars and seventy-six cents ($8,727.76);

(2) upon the cause of action set forth in the second count of appellee's petition, a judgment in favor of The United States dismissing same;

(3) upon the counterclaim pleaded by The United States of America, a judgment in favor of the appellee, Union Electric Light & Power Company, dismissing said counterclaim.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
138. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Brilliant Coal Company.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. C. Belknap Glass Company,
Appellant,
176. vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.
The United States of America.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Donegan, Appellant,
185. vs. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solici-
B. E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal.
tor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the appellee in support of the motion.

Henry P. Kieth, Late Collector,
Petitioner,
295. vs. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitch-
Emma B. Johnson, as Administratrix.
ell for the petitioner.

Marion-Rye Valley Railway Company,
Appellant,
315. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

Port Gardner Investment Company
611. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States of America.

Norman S. Bowles, Appellant,
554. vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden.

The motion to advance this cause, and for admission of the appellant to bail, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely in opposition thereto.

Leo A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
454. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with Nos. 192 and 503, heretofore assigned for November 23d next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark in that behalf.

Frank E. Stripe et al., Receivers,
Petitioners,
496. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with Nos. 192 and 503, heretofore assigned for November 23d, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin A. Matthews for the petitioners.

The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph Hanson,
Plaintiff in Error,
681. vs.
James W. Caldwell, Receiver, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh M. Rowland for the plaintiff in error.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
14, Orig'l. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The Report of the Commissioner herein was received and filed, on motion of Mr. Wade H. Ellis in that behalf.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
626. vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer etc.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon Hornstein in behalf of Mr. Hiram T. Gilbert and Mr. C. Paul Tallmadge for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. CharlesE. Hughes, Mr. Charles S. Dineen, Mr. Robert J. Polonie, and Mr. Frederick D. Silber in opposition thereto.

Northern Cedar Company, plaintiff in Error,
729. vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington, et al.
Yakima County Horticultural Union,
Plaintiff in Error,
730. vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington, et al.
C. W. Chamberlain & Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
731. vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blaine Mallan in that behalf.

The City of Sour Lake et al.,
Petitioners,
639. vs.
Vernon H. Branch.

Leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent herein, on motion of Mr. George E. Chamberlain in that behalf.

Southern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
218. vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc.
James C. Davis, Director General,
Plaintiff in Error,
219. vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc.

The joint motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Clark in that behalf.

Leopold Zimmermann et al., Appellants,
628. vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with cases Nos. 80 and 81 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in that behalf.

Leopold Zimmermann et al., Appellants,
629. vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The motion to advance this cause to be heard with cases Nos. 80 and 81 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in that behalf.

Deutsche Bank of Berlin, Germany, Appellant,
630. vs.
Leopold Zimmermann et al.

Motion to advance to be heard with cases Nos. 80 and 81 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in that behalf.

Max Pottash et al., Petitioners,
703. vs.
Birds, Heilgers, Ironsides, Inc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein for the respondent, on motion of Mr. George B. Covington in that behalf.

Clara Showalter, Plaintiff in Error,
72. vs.
Georgia Valliere Hampton.

The motion to require the plaintiff in error herein to supersede the judgment of the lower court, and to give bond, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Blair for the defendant in error.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc., Petitioners,
623. vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector etc.

The motion for leave to file suggestions of the Chinese Legation herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Conlon in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert in that behalf.

The City of Tulsa et al., Appellants,
421. vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Co. et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

The City of Tulsa et al.,
Appellants,
421. vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel.

American Smelting & Refining Company, Petitioner,
490. vs.
George Campbell Carson.

Motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Wallace in that behalf; and the motion was denied.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion for leave to amend the bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the complainant; with leave to file answer thereto, on motion of Mr. Edmund D. Adcock for the defendants. Leave was granted to withdraw the appearance of Clyde L. Day as counsel for the defendants.

Panama Rail Road Company,
Petitioner,
260. vs.
Agapito Vasquez, Administrator.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Manton Wyvell in that behalf.

The City of Tulsa et al.,
Appellants,
421. vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the appellants.

George H. Bearell,
Plaintiff in Error,
247. vs.
The State of Ohio et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Wilson Brown, III, for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Province M. Pogue and Mr. Harry M. Hoffheimer for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

William H. Chatfield, Jr., Plaintiff in Error, 248. vs. The State of Ohio.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Wilson Brown, III, for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frank F. Dinsmore for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, (Case "A"). —Orig'l. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. H. Robinson for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, (Case "B").—,Orig'l. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. H. Robinson for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, (Case "C").__,Orig'l.Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. H. Robinson for the petitioner.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al., Appellants, 567. vs. New York Telephone Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel in that behalf.

George E. Bowling et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 236. vs. Frank Beaver et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Gore in behalf of Mr. Dick Rice for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Vern E. Thompson and Mr. Halbert H. McClure for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,
88. vs.
J. M. Luna et al.

The suggestion of the resignation of J. M. Luna as a member of the State Corporation Commission of New Mexico, and the motion to substitute Ed. C. Tafoya, successor as a member of the State Corporation Commission of New Mexico, as a party appellee herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Markell for the appellant.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
144. vs.
Mrs. Abi Janney.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, Mr. Merritt Starr, and Mr. Albert L. Hopkins for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
493. vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., et al., Executors etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. Guy Mason in that behalf.

Harman W. McMahon,
Petitioner,
462. vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. D. Scully for the petitioner.

Eastern Products Corporation et al., Petitioners,
394. vs.
Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Company.

Leave was granted to file a brief of the petitioner herein within ten days, and a brief of the respondent herein within twenty days, on motion of Mr. Charles Clark in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of the City of Monterey.
——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. J. Hughes for the petitioner.

Pauline Andre DeLa Mettrie et al., Appellants,
346. vs.
Elizabeth Pratt de Gasquett James et al.

David Keane, Receiver, Appellant,
347. vs.
Elizabeth Pratt de Gasquett James et al.

The resignation of Thomas W. Miller as Alien Property Custodian was suggested by Mr. J. Robert Hayes and Mr. Guy H. Johnson for the appellant; and Frederick C. Hicks, Successor as Alien Property Custodian, was ordered substituted as a party appellee herein.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al., Appellants,
184. vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

The motion to dismiss for failure to print the record, and the motion to dismiss or affirm herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. Clark and Mr. J. C. Cooper for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. W. Dewhurst, Mr. John C. Jones, and Mr. Joseph H. Jones for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al., Appellants,
184. vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

The motion that this cause be heard on six copies of the record on the former appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Jones for the appellants.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion to set this cause for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel in that behalf.

The State of Vermont, Complainant,
4, Original. vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

The motion for the appointment of a commissioner to take testimony herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Austin for the complainant.

Thomas E. Buford, Petitioner,
395. vs.
North American Accident Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioner.

N. M. Baldwin, Petitioner,
412. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry S. Hall for the petitioner.

Laura Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Simeon Keyser, deceased,
Petitioner,
452. vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cyrus A. Geers for the petitioner.

Lucy Fisher et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
459. vs.
E. J. Crider.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petitioner.

Don Chafin, Petitioner,
460. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Holt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Guiseppe Napolitano, Petitioner,
466. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Oakes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

L. J. Schwaub & Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
469. vs.
Tennessee Egg Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. CharlesC. Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Hyde for the respondent.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
474. vs.
Z. L. Jarrett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Prendergast and Mr. T. D. Gresham for the petitioner.

M. Scheuer, and C.W. Cobb, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
475. vs.
St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watson and Mr. Samuel Pasco for the petitioners, and by Mr. Daniel MacDougald and Mr. J. E. D. Yonge for the respondent.

The State of Montana, Petitioner,
476. vs.
Sunburst Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. A. Foote for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Hurd and Mr. H. C. Hall for the respondent.

Salvadore Larrocca, Petitioner,
478. vs.
C. J. Everett, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donelson Caffery for the petitioner.

Pan-American Bank and Trust Company et al., Petitioners,
479. vs.
National City Bank of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph S.Rounds, Mr. Francis E. Neagle, and Mr. Eugene Congleton for the petitioners, and by Mr. John A. Garver and Mr. Carl A. Mead for the respondent.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant of the State of New York, Petitioner,
483. vs.
William Clabaugh et al., as Members of and Constituting the Board of Accountancy for the District of Columbia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith and Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the petitioner.

C. H. Hodgkinson, Petitioner,
484. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carlos Bee for the petitioner.

F. M. Withers, Petitioner,
485. vs.
William E. White, as Trustee of the Estate of E. Y. Foley, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Henry Harris for the petitioner.

F. M. Withers, Petitioner,
486. vs.
William E. White, as Trustee of the Estate of E. Y. Foley, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Henry Harris for the petitioner.

Withers Bros., Petitioner,
487. vs.
William E. White, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of E. Y. Foley, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Henry Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. E. Barbour for the respondent.

Withers Bros., Petitioner,
488. vs.
William E. White, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of E. Y. Foley, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Henry Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr.

H. E. Barbour for the respondent.

J. L. Chapman, Commissioner of Banking of the State of Texas, et al., Petitioners,
489. vs.
R. M. Clayton, Jr., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Perry G. Dedman and Mr. B.L. Agerton for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. C. Rowe for the respondents.

American Smelting and Refining Company, Petitioner,
490. vs.
George Campbell Carson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. William K. White, Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. Albert M. Austin, and Mr. George Donworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. C. Rowe for the respondent.

Edmond C. Fletcher, Petitioner,
492. vs.
Percy Kellogg, Executor of the Estate of Sherman Kellogg, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmond C. Fletcher for the petitioner.

Louisiana and Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
494. vs.
John B. Gardiner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip S. Pugh, Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, Mr. Harry McCall, and Mr. James Henry Bruns for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

A. J. Thigpen et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
495. vs.
Midland Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer E. Grinstead and Mr. J. R. Spielman for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Joe H. Tiger, Plaintiff in Error,
497. vs.
William M. Powell et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. William O. Beall for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Herman Peterson, Petitioner,
507. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner.

Frank C. Mebane, as Receiver of Symes Foundation, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
509. vs.
Staten Island Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Catchings and Mr. Merle I. St. John for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. A. S. Gilbert, Mr. Royal E. T. Riggs, Mr. Morgan J.O'Brien, and Mr. John F. Hughes for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
511. vs.
The John C. Winston Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. O. C. Fuller, and Mr. Edward E. Reardon for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
514. vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. O. C. Fuller, Mr. W. A. Sweet, and Mr. H. A. Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. John T. Evans and Mr. John Lewis Smith for the respondent.

Mary Ellen Dickson et al., Petitioners,
516. vs.
A. C. Neal et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Oldfield for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. P. Strait for the respondents.

R. M. McColgan, Petitioner,
524. vs.
Charles H. Clark.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George D. Collins for the petitioner.

Samuel Sanday et al., Petitioners,
526. vs.
The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Ira Floyd Letts, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Horace T. Atkins for the respondent.

The American Automobile Accessories Company, Petitioner,
527. vs.
Jerome H. Remick & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Allen for the petitioner.

Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
529. vs.
Donald Page et al., Administrators etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G.Dodge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles F. Perkins for the respondent.

William F. Falligan, Petitioner
530 vs.
Citizens Trust & Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. I. Gilbert and Mr. James E. Fenton for the petitioner and by Mr. Oscar Lawler, Mr. William J. Hunsaker, Mr. E. W. Britt, and Mr. T. B. Cosgrove for the respondent.

John F. Herr, Petitioner
531 vs.
Citizens Trust & Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. I. Gilbert and Mr. James E. Fenton for the petitioner and by Mr. Oscar Lawler, Mr. William J. Hunsaker, Mr. E. W. Britt, and Mr. T. B. Cosgrove for the respondent.

Giorgio Borelli, as Administrator etc., Petitioner
532 vs.
International Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the petitioner and by Mr. William S. Rann for the respondent.

The Pullman Company, Petitioner
534 vs.
Jacob S. Waln, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioner and by Mr. John Lewis Evans for the respondents.

Domenico Lazzaro, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Luther Weedin, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of Seattle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Alexander Sedgwick, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Thomas E. Wing, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hector M. Hitchings and Mr. Hugh W. Ogden for the petitioner and by Mr. Philip W. Russell for the respondent.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Charles Tittle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles and Mr. W. T. Kinder for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward Davidson for the respondent.

Kock Shing, Petitioner,
540 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Flint Damon and Walter Bates Farr for the petitioner.

Kock Tung, Petitioner,
541 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Flint Damon and Walter Bates Farr for the petitioner.

Alfred T. White, Petitioner,
542 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Gorham and Mr. James Kiefer for the petitioner.

James Skipitar, Petitioner,
544 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Skipitar, pro se.

Mississippi Central Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
545 vs.
Ernest Knight.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Brady for the petitioners and by Mr. J. W. Cassidy and Mr. E. L. Dent for the respondent.

Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Company, Petitioner,
546 vs.
Joseph W. Isherwood, etc., Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Junius Parker and Mr. G. S. Ferguson, Jr. for the petitioner and by Mr. C. V. Meredith, Mr. F. P. Fish, Mr. Hubert Howson and Mr. Charles H. Howson for the respondents.

The United States of America, ex rel. Wilbur H. Rock, Petitioner,
547 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph, et al., Commissioners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert and Mr. R. H. Yeatman for the petitioner.

James McDonald, Jr. et al., Infants by their guardian ad litem Charles V. Imlay, Petitioners,
555 vs.
Lawrence Maxwell, et al., Executors.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, Mr. M. M. Allison and Mr. John J. Hamilton for the petitioners.

The United States, Petitioner,
560 vs.
Stone & Downer Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward P. Sharretts for the respondent.

Isadore Luvisch, Petitioner,
560 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. J. Ringolsky and Mr. L. S. Harvey for the petitioner and by Mr. Sollicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

American Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
American Trust Company, Guardian etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Tyne and Mr. Charles E. Cox for the petitioner.

The Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company, Petitioner,
566 vs.
C. G. Hendricks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Wills for the petitioner and by Mr. William H. Watkins for the respondent.

Fannie B. Jones, et al., Administrators etc., Petitioners
569 vs.
Pearl Mosier et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Preston A. Shinn for the petitioners and by Mr. C. K. Templeton for the respondents.

James C. Davis, Agent, Petitioner,
570 vs.
Louis Phillips, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts for the County of Bristol was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the petitioner and by Mr. David R. Radovsky for the respondents.

Mary Ann Parramore, Widow etc., et al., Petitioners,
571 vs.
The Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Spencer Gordon, Mr. Mahlon E. Wilson, and Mr. R. B. Webster for the petitioners and by Mr. Waldemar Van Cott for the respondent.

W. D. Kynerd, Petitioner,
572 vs.
John A. Hulen, Receiver etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick and Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioner and by Mr. Joseph Hudson Barwise, Jr. for the respondents.

Leong Don, Petitioner,
573 vs.
William T. Christy, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
574 vs.
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer T. Dick and Mr. M. F. Gallagher for the petitioner in support of the petition and by Mr. Luther M. Walter, Mr. James G. Condon and Mr. William E. Lamb for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Mystic Steamship Company, Petitioner,
575 vs.
Diamond-O Navigation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Neal and Mr. Harry B. Beckett for the petitioner and by Mr. Erskine Wood for the respondent.

William F. Young, Petitioner,
576 vs.
J. E. Stillwell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Dumont Smith and Mr. W. I. Gilbert for the petitioner and by Mr. Leslie R. Hewitt and Mr. F. C. Price for the respondent.

W. Martin Jones, Jr., Petitioner,
577 vs.
Thomas Midgley et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Martin Jones, Jr. for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward C. Taylor for the respondent.

Seward K. Lowe et al., Petitioners,
580 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude Nowlin for the petitioner and by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondent.

Herman Mielke, Petitioner,
581 vs.
James B. Schermerhorn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the petitioner and by Mr. R. J. Powell for the respondent.

O. K. Eysenbach, et al., Petitioners,
583 vs.
Sammie Maharkey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Stuart for the petitioners and by Mr. Edmund Leahley for the respondent.

George Dail, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., et al., Petitioners,
585 vs.
H. A. Hart & Brother.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. D. Warren for the petitioner and by Mr. L. I. Moore for the respondent.

Samuel Schechter, Petitioner,
586 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. Drescher for the petitioner.

W. S. McCray, Petitioner,
587 vs.
Sapulpa Petroleum Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the petitioner and by Mr. Jerre P. O'Meara for the respondent.

Joseph Levin, et al., Petitioners,
588 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellwood P. Morey and John L. McNab for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and by Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner,
591 vs.
Howe Totten.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis H. Stephens and Mr. Robert L. Williams for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the respondent.

Frederick M. Littleton, Petitioner,
598 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Preston and Mrs. Annette Abbott Adams for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The United States, ex rel. Troy Laundry Machinery Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
600 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Wilkinson, Mr. Henry M. Huxley and Mr. Ralph Munden for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler and Mr. Harry E. Knight for the respondent.

Road District No. 4 of Shelby County Texas, Petitioner,
602 vs.
Home Bank and Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hampson Gary for the petitioner and by Mr. H. M. Garwood for the respondent.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company, Petitioner,
604 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Bailey and Mr. Oscar Mitchell for the petitioner and by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. G. A. Youngquist for the respondent.

City of South Houston et al., Petitioners,
605 vs.
John L. Carman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis R. Bryan for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert L. Cole for the respondent.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Sagaporack" Petitioner,
607 vs.
Norfolk Dredging Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, Mr. J. Frank Staley and Mr. H. H. Rumble for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry H. Little for the respondent.

Carl Franz Adolf Otto Ingernohl, Petitioner,
614 vs.
Walter E. Olsen and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Meyerstein and Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner and by Mr. Allison D. Gibbs for the respondent.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
617 vs.
Frank Sanders.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Hann and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Lewis & Conger, et al., Petitioners,
618 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Gibbon Duffy for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assitant Attorney General Hoppin for the respondent.

S. William Levinson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 619

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Miller Outcalt, Mr. Dudley C. Outcalt, and Mr. Joseph W. Huntzman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Mead Fibre Company, Petitioner, vs. W. H. Varn et al., Copartners, etc. 620

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. B. Grier for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Moorer for the respondents.

Willie Conner et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. H. U. Bartlett et al. 621

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

S. Blattner, doing business as United Produce Company, Petitioner, vs. A. H. Lamborn et al. 622

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. M. Toomer, Mr. W. T. Stockton, Mr. Herman Ulmer, and Mr. A. B. Lovett for the respondents.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc. Petitioners, vs. W. Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., et al. 623

The petition for a writ of certiorar herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. Allison D. Gibbs, and Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., for the respondents.

The City of Seattle, Petitioner,
627 vs.
Puget Sound Power and Light Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy for the petitioner, and by Mr. James B. Howe for the respondent.

William E. Moore et al., Petitioners,
632 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Flansburg for the petitioners.

J. H. Bunnell & Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
633 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Pumphrey for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. F. H. Betts for the respondent.

Charles H. Moore et al., Petitioners,
637 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Flansburg for the petitioners.

Lawrence Moore Byerly, Petitioner,
638 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Wilson and Mr. Elmer J. Burkett for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson for the respondents.

The City of Scur Lake et al., Petitioners, vs. Vernon H. Brauch. 639

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, Mr. J. D. Houston, Mr. Claude I. Depew, and by Mr. W. E. Stanley for the respondent.

Charles H. Unverzagt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 640

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords and Mr. Edwin C. Dutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Charles H. Unverzagt, Petitioner, vs. E. B. Benn, as United States Marshal for the Western District of Washington. 641

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords and Mr. Edwin C. Dutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Pinkie E. Moore et al., Petitioners, vs. Lincoln Hospital Association et al. 642

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Flansburg for the petitioners.

Pierce Wrapping Machine Company, Petitioner, vs. Terkelsen Machine Company. 643

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Harrison F. Lyman, and Mr. Albert L. Ely for the petitioner, and by Mr. George P. Dike for the respondent.

The Fisheries Products Company, Petitioners,
644 vs.
Abraham S. See & Depew, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. D. Warren for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert H. Elder and Mr. Otho S. Bowling for the respondent.

Elizabeth F. Shukert et al., Executrices, etc., Petitioners,
653 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Nebraska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Merchants Bank & Trust Company, Petitioners,
654 vs.
J. Frank Pflug et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph E. Alexander and Mr. C. T. Bundy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irvine T. Gilruth for the respondents.

George Owen Squier, Petitioner,
656 vs.
American Telephone & Telegraph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Randolph Hicks and Mr. George F. Canfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

Olof L. Bruce et al., petitioners,
657 vs.
Dudley K. Woodward, Jr., as Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H.V. Mercer for the petitioner, and by Mr. George S. Grimes for the respondent.

Robert Gallagher et al., Appellants,
658 vs.
John E. Hannigan, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry for the appellants in support of the petition, and by Mr. John E. Hannigan for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Petroleum Iron Works Company, Inc., Petitioner,
659 vs.
Willis C. Wright.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Preston Lawther for the petitioner.

F. M. (Bee) Adams et al., petitioners,
660 vs.
The State of Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Cobb and Mr. Elisha Scott for the petitioners.

Erie Iron & Metal Company, Petitioner,
661 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Brooks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Herman J. Galloway for the respondent.

Empire Engineering Company, Plaintiff in error,
662 vs.
White, Gratwick and Mitchell, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adelbert Moot and Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Laurence E. Caffey for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Charles A. Stoneham, Petitioner,
664 vs.
Walter A. Clifford et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max D. Steuer for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Chadbourne and Mr. Francis L. Kohlman for the respondents.

John Browning, Petitioner,
665 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. P. White and Mr. Allen W. Comstock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
666 vs.
John T. Diederich, Administrator of the Estate of Leonard Callihan, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. LeWright Browning and Mr. Stanley Reed for the petitioner, and by Mr. John F. Hager for the respondent.

W. P. Black et al., Petitioners,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman B. Morrell for the petitioners.

Panama Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
668 vs.
Simon Thecktisteu.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Edward Mitchell for the petitioner.

John W. Ellenberg, Petitioner,
669 vs.
Birmingham Belt Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugo L. Black for the petitioner.

Michael T. Naughton,
Petitioner,
671 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alonzo M. Hanes and Corinne L. Rice for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Norman T. Whitaker,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman T. Whitaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Ex parte: Ernest Stoffregen,
Petitioner.
673

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. William G. Johnson, and Mr. Charles E. Tullar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. H. E. Knight in opposition thereto.

The United States of America at the relation of The Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
676 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. W. Moore, Mr. F. H. Moore, and Mr. T.P. Littlepage for the petitioners, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the respondent.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1925, CONTINUED.

The Sugarland Industries et al., Petitioners,
677 vs.
Old Colony Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Garwood for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry C. Coke for the respondent.

Edmond Van Dyk, Petitioner,
678 vs.
William A.Young.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Cocke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent.

Joseph Seeman et al., Petitioners,
680 vs.
Philadelphia Warehouse Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel F. Frank for the petitioners, and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts and Mr. Charles A. Riegelman for the respondent.

Jacob L. Fisher and Frederick W. Fisher, Petitioners,
682 vs.
James F. A. Clark et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman S. Hertwig for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clarence J. Shearn for the respondents.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
683 vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Edward S. Stringer, and Mr. Daniel Taylor for the petitioner.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
684 vs.
Fred A. Elder.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Edward S. Stringer, and Mr. Daniel Taylor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

E. J. Fitzgerald, Petitioner,
685 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Pope and Mr. Frank E. Markness for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

William A. Rhea, Petitioner,
686 vs.
Thomas C. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hackney for the petitioner.

Herman D. Ruhm, Petitioner,
688 vs.
Herschel C. Ogden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Cavanagh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merritt Lane for the respondent.

General Fire Extinguisher Company, Petitioner,
689 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis W. Southgate and Mr. C. Ellery Edwards for the respondent.

Thomas McDonnell, Petitioner,
690 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Golding and Mr. Charles A. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Oscar R. Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Washington Market Company,
Petitioner,
691 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Douglas and Mr. Alexander Wolf for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Robert L. Messel,
Petitioner,
694 vs.
Foundation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. F. Pierson for the petitioner.

Eberhart Steel Products Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. R. R. Koch for the respondent.

Max Pottash et al., Petitioners,
703 vs.
Birds, Heilgers, Ironsides, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. George B. Covington for the respondent.

Louis Underleider et al., Petitioners,
704 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Albert Eick, Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Mary C. H. Frenzer et al., Petitioners,
706 vs.
Arthur J. Frenzer, also known as Arthur Franzer Mackey et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will H. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur R. Wells for the respondents.

Ephraim A. Schwarzenberg, Petitioner,
707 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen and Mr. Walter S. Hilborn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Harry Nadl, Petitioner,
708 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Salvador Serra, Petitioner,
709 vs.
The Estate of the deceased Lazaro Mota et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Fisher and Mr. Edwin S. Puller for the petitioner.

Creamery Package Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
711 vs.
H. H. Miller Industries Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lincoln B. Smith and Mr. Clyde Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Glen E. Smith for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
712 vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
713 vs.
United States ex rel. G. Thomas Birkenstock et al., Executors etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewell Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the respondents.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
714 vs.
Alfred Klesner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop", Hooper and Klesner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Olin C. Fuller, and Mr. Charles Melvin Neff for the petitioner.

Mg Lin Go, Petitioner,
715 vs.
Luther Weedin, as
Commissioner of Immigration
at the Port of Seattle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan and Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Oscar R. Luhring for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
716 vs.
Central Railroad Company of
New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner.

Buenaventura Lopez et al.,
Petitioners,
717 vs.
El Hogar Filipino, sociedad mitua
de construccion y pristamos, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Wallace and Mr. Pedro Guerara for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clyde A. De Witt for the respondent.

Edward F. Goltra, Petitioner,
718 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War
of the United States, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jos. T. Davis and Mr. Douglas W. Robert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, Mr. Lon O. Hooker, and Mr. Frank J. Staley for the respondents.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. William F. Brims et al.

719

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan, Mr. Roger Shale, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert W. Childs, Mr. Albert Fink, and Mr. Hope Thompson for the respondents.

Albert H. Benhard et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles A. Stoneham.

720

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Chadbourne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Max D. Steuer for the respondent.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Federal Trade Commission.

721

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Olin C. Fuller for the respondent.

The Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Hugh L. Britton, as Infant, by his next friend, Barry Britton.

723

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarke E. Baldwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. D. Chandler for the respondent.

Susquehanna Steamship Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. A. O. Anderson & Company, Inc.,

724

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. S. Hertwig and Mr. John A. McManus for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General
725 vs.	
Eastman Kodak Company et al.	

Mitchell, Mr. Olin C. Fuller, and Mr. William A. Sweet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence P. Moser and Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

Dr. B. W. Crabb, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eustace Smith for the petitioner, and
728 vs.	
Warren H. Kerby et al.	

by Mr. Charles B. Griffith for the respondents.

Edmond Fenstermacher, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Platt Hubbell for the petitioner, and
732 vs.	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, etc.	

by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Luther Burns, and Mr. John E. Dolman for the respondent.

George D. Harter Bank, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.
733 vs.	
Richard Inglis.	

George D. Harter Bank, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.
734 vs.	
Mary P. Charles.	

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
Howard P. Domigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
J. E. Brate.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
737 vs.
Mrs. F. U. LeMay.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.

Ellamar Mining Company,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The Alaska Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George de Steiguer and Mr. John H. Powell for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Bogle and Mr. Lane Summers for the respondent.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island, et al.,
Petitioners,
741 vs.
Attleboro Steam & Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Courtof the State of Rhode Island was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur M. Allen, Mr. Charles P. Sisson, Mr. Roland W. Boyden, and Mr. Frank D. Comerford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert G. Dodge, Mr. Archibald C. Matteson and Mr. Harold S. Davis for the respondent.

Charles DeWitt, Petitioner,
742 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Wallace Bryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Moshie Berenson, Petitioner,
744 vs.
H. C. Vogel Company, Inc.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, of the State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis P. Garland for the petitioner.

Patrick O'Donoghue,
Petitioner,
745 vs.
Mary Jaeger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the respondent.

Capital City Water Company,
Plaintiff in error,
20 vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William B. Thompson,
Plaintiff in error,
21 vs.
The City of St. Louis et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Apalachicola Land & Development Company, Plaintiff in error,
43 vs.
W. A. McRae, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rivers Buford and Mr. Fred T. Myers for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. E. Tillman Davis for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Daisy M. Scott et al., Plaintiffs in error,
48 vs.
The City of Columbus, Ohio.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Leach for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan and Mr. John S. Hogan for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Arkansas River Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,
197 vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. M. Williams for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Joseph S. Clark and Mr. Thomas C. Wilson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Plaintiff in error,
323 vs.
Leo J. Drum et al., etc.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence A. Anderson
331 vs.
James W. Clune.

This cause was submitted to the pursuant to the 23rd Rule, consideration of the Court by Mr. Burgess W. Marshall in behalf of Clarence A. Anderson, and by Mr. Norman T. Mason in behalf of James W. Clune.

A. L. Hartline,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John B. Bailey,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Interstate Cooperate Company, Petitioner,
616 vs.
Ronald S. Swain.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
1 Original vs.
The Tennessee Copper Company
et al.

The joint motion for leave to file a stipulation for extension of contract was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. McConnell for the complainant.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
2 Original vs.
The State of Tennessee.

It was heretofore ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, assigned for hearing on the exceptions to the Report of the Commissioners for this day.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
3 Original vs.
The State of Texas.

The status of this case was reported to the Court.

The State of Vermont,
Complainant,
4 Original vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

The status of this case was reported to the Court.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
5 Original vs.
The Bulls Ferry Chemical Company.

IN EQUITY.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,

Complainant,

6 Original vs. IN EQUITY.

Valvoline Oil Company.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,

Complainant,

7 Original vs. IN EQUITY.

Midland Linseed Products Company of New Jersey.

It appearing to the Court that authority of counsel for the complainant to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,

Complainant,

8 Original vs. IN EQUITY.

Corn Products Refining Company.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,

Complainant,

9 Original vs.

Barrett Manufacturing Company. IN EQUITY.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
10 Original vs.
The State of Minnesota.

IN EQUITY.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the bill of complaint herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Nevada,
Complainant,
11 Original vs.
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On motion of Mr. William C. Prentiss for the complainant, it was ordered that this cause be continued.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
12 Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The status of this case was reported to the Court.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant,
The United States of America,
intervener.

The status of this case was reported to the Court.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 14 Original vs. The State of New York et al.	The status of this case was reported to the Court.
The State of Arkansas, Complainant, 15 Original vs. The State of Mississippi.	Rule ordered to issue to show cause why the bill of complaint herein should not be dismissed.
The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, 16 Original vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.	The status of this case was reported to the Court.
The United States of America, Complainant, 17 Original vs. The State of Minnesota.	The status of this case was reported to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell on behalf of the complainant.
The United States of America, Complainant, 18 Original vs. The State of Minnesota.	The status of this case was reported to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell on behalf of the complainant.
The State of Michigan, Complainant, 19 Original vs. The State of Wisconsin.	The status of this case was reported to the Court.
The State of New Jersey, Complainant, 20 Original vs. Harry M. Daugherty, etc., et al.	Mr. Harry R. Coulomb having suggested the resignation of Harry M. Daugherty, as Attorney General, and William C. Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, it is ordered that John G. Sargent as Attorney General and Howard M. Gore as Secretary of Agriculture, be substituted as parties defendant herein.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
20 Original vs.
Harry M. Daugherty etc., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Cran, Mr. William Newcorn and Mr. Harry R. Coulomb for the complainant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Reeder for the defendant.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
21 Original vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The status of this case was reported to the Court.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
22 Original vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The status of this case was reported to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash on behalf of the complainant.

Auditore Comtracting Company, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
1 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota et al.,
Appellants,
2 vs.
Duluth Street Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Glassman,
Petitioner,
8 vs.
Robert C. Rand, Temporary Receiver of Herman Brenner and Jack Brenner, Individually etc.

It is ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the petitioner herein on or before Monday, the 26th day of October, 1925, why the above entitled cause should not be dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chriss Landsberg,
Petitioner,
9 vs.
The San Francisco & Portland Steamship Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 35.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
2 Original vs.
The State of Tennessee.

This cause was argued on the exceptions to the report of the commissioners by Mr. G. T. Fitzhugh for the defendant, and by Mr. Caruthers Ewing for the complainant.

Joseph P. Margolin,
Petitioner,
254 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Miss Susan Brandeis and Mr. Benjamin S. Kirsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Terrence Druggan,

Appellant,

415 vs.

Palmer E. Anderson, United States Marshal, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Michael J. Ahern for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court [illegible]

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leon Hornstein, It is ordered that Francis X. Busch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger O'Donnell, It is ordered that Michael J. Matta, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements, It is ordered that Thomas C. Nairn, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Meserve, It is ordered that Carter Smith, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John L. Anderson,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
12 vs. State of Georgia.
The City of Macon et al.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Riley Smith,

Plaintiff in error,

13 vs.

The State of Nebraska.

It is ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the plaintiff in error herein on or before Monday, the 26th day of October, 1925, why the above entitled cause should not be dismissed.

Ray A. Lower,

Plaintiff in error,

14 vs.

The State of Nebraska.

It is ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the plaintiff in error herein on or before Monday, the 26th day of October, 1925, why the above entitled cause should not be dismissed.

Terrence Druggan, Appellant,
415 vs.
Palmer E. Anderson, U.S. Marshal.
Terrence Druggan,

Appellant,

415 vs.

Palmer E. Anderson, United States Marshal, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Michael J. Ahearn for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per. Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellant, and by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellee.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The People of the State of California.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John H. Riordan for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Judd Dewey, It is ordered that Stanley P. Hall, Esquire, of Taunton, State of Massachusetts; and Arthur V. Harper, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Regis Noel, It is ordered that Thomas J. Frailey, Esquire, of Emmitsburg, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, It is ordered that Earl Anderson, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly:

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1925, - CONTINUED.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that George D. Seburman, Esquire, and Benton Moore, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Road Improvement District No. 1
of Clark County, Arkansas et al.,
Appellants,
19 vs.
Charles S. Thornton and Justus
Chancellor.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, of counsel for the appellees, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, subject to a motion to restore showing satisfactory evidence of cause for delay to be submitted within ten days.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Woerishoffer et al.,
Executrix etc., appellants,
11 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Individually etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
15 vs.
The City of New York et al.
Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
16 vs.
John T. Delaney, as Commissioner
of Docks etc.

One and one-half hours allowed each side for the argument of this cause.
This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Charles J. Mehrbas for the defendants in error.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that William F. Collins, Esquire, of El Reno, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Scott, It is ordered that George A. Lytle, Esquire, and John Frederick Hock, Esquire, of Edwardsville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Piqua Hosiery Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.
Appeal from the Court of Claims.
28

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1925. - CONTINUED.

Stanley P. Hall et al., Administrators etc., Appellants, vs. F. Alexander Chandler et al., etc.

17

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Stanley P. Hall for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Stanley P. Hall et al., Administrators etc., Appellants, vs. F. Alexander Chandler et al., etc.

17

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General etc., et al., Appellants, vs. A. Sardell.

18

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Earl Anderson for the appellants, continued by Mr. T. G. Nairn and Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Earl Anderson for the appellants.

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant, vs. W. P. McCullough et al.

22

This cause was argued by Mr. A. Scott Thompson for the appellants, and by Mr. Joseph C. Stone for the appellees.

Prince Tyner,

Plaintiff in error,

23 vs.

Henry Buffington et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Carter Smith for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Fort, It is ordered that James R. Bedgood, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Dykman, It is ordered that Edward M. Deegan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Milverton, It is ordered that Cornell Sidney Franklin, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that George M. Green, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cornelius J. Jones, it is ordered that Carter W. Wesley, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Albert Eick, Petitioner,
705 vs.
United States of America.

Leave granted to file reply brief for petitioner on or before Thursday next, on motion of Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, Petitioner,
546 vs.
Joseph W. Isherwood, etc., Trustee.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift and Company,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prince Tyner,
Plaintiff in error,
23 vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Carter Smith for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiff in error.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in error,
24 vs.
The State of Georgia, as Owner etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Milburn and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry C. Peeples for the defendant in error.

Henry P. Mueller et al.,
Appellants,
27 vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

On motion of Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the appellants, It is ordered that this cause be continued.

The United States,
Appellant,
29 vs.
Boston Insurance Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant and by Mr. Abram R. Serven for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court [illegible] next

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Shields M. Goodwin, Esquire, of Warren, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence C. Fowler, It is ordered that Joseph C. H. Flynn, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York; and Alfred C. Bennett, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Long, It is ordered that Robert B. Bennett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul J. Christian, It is ordered that A. Diaz Viera, Esquire, of Rio Piedras, Territory of Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas Agnello, Frank Agnello, Stephen Alba, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

6

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed as to the petitioner Frank Agnello, and affirmed as to the remaining petitioners; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy and Sylvester J. Pierce, Appellants, vs. Frank M. Tyler, as Sheriff of Erie County, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

125

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

J. W. Patterson, Doing Business as J. W. Patterson Commission Company; J. A. Carlisle, J. P. Oglesby, etc., et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

221

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause reassigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel.
Joseph Hanson,
Plaintiff in error,
661 vs.
James W. Caldwell, Receiver et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, for the reason that the Court has examined the record and finds the writ of error to be frivolous.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
14 Original vs.
The State of New York et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the Report of the Receiver herein be, and the same is hereby, ordered to be received and filed; and leave is granted to open, file, and publish the testimony herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clara Shewalter,
Plaintiff in error,
72 vs.
Georgia Valliere Hampton.

On consideration of the motion to require the plaintiff in error herein to supersede the judgment and give bond, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed upon the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, October 19th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
623 vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file suggestions of the Chinese Legation herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that the defendants, The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, file an answer or make other defense on or before Monday, January 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland,
-- Original. Petitioner,
(Case "A")

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, -- Original. Petitioner. (Case "A)

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Morris A. Soper, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, November 16th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why a peremptory writ should not issue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner, -- Original. (Case "B")

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner, -- Original. (Case "B")

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Morris A. Soper, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, November 16th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why a peremptory writ should not issue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner, -- Original. (Case "C")

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the State of Maryland,
Petitioner,
-- Original.
(Case "O")

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Morris A. Soper, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, November 16th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why a peremptory writ should not issue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,
88 vs.
J. M. Luna et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute appellees herein by consent,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, under paragraph 4 of rule 17, section 11 of the Act of Congress of February 13, 1925.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the City of Monterey,
Petitioner,
-- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, in the exercise of the Court's discretion, without prejudice to the petitioner's other remedies.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to set this cause for hearing,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The State of Vermont,
Complainant,
4 Original vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of Commissioners to take testimony and documentary evidence herein, pursuant to the stipulation filed herein on June 1st, 1921,

It is now here ordered by this Court that Benjamin W. Crouch, of Concord, New Hampshire, and John E. Mimms, of Burlington, Vermont, be, and they are hereby, appointed as such Commissioners.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
1 Original vs.
The Tennessee Copper Company et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a stipulation for extension of the contract herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. And it is further ordered that a rule issue, returnable on or before the first day of the next Term, requiring the parties to show cause why the suit should not be concluded and the cause stricken from the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector,
Petitioner,
295 vs.
Emma B. Johnson, as
Administratrix.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marion-Rye Valley Railway
Company, Appellant,
315 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Port Gardner Investment Company,
611 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leo A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
454 vs.
The United States of America.
Frank E. Stripe et al., Receivers, Petitioners,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases to be heard with cases Nos. 192 and 503, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 2d next, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, with leave to counsel in these cases, Nos. 454 and 496, to submit on briefs on that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Cedar Company, Plaintiff in error,
729 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington et al.
Yakima County Horticultural Union, Plaintiff in error,
730 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington et al.
C. W. Chamberlain & Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
731 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, January 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
218 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General, Plaintiff in error,
219 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leopold Zimmermann et al.,
Appellants,
628 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.
Leopold Zimmermann et al.,
Appellants,
629 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.
Deutsche Bank of Berlin, Germany,
Appellant,
630 vs.
Leopold Zimmermann et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases to be heard with cases Nos. 80 and 81, when the latter cases are reached in the regular call of the docket,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, with leave to counsel in these cases, Nos. 628, 629 and 630, to submit on briefs on that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Rail Road Company,
Petitioner,
260 vs.
Agapito Vasquez, Administrator.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, placed on the Summary Docket and granted, and the cause/assigned for argument on Monday, January 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Tulsa et al.,
Appellants,
421 vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company
et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility
Commissioners et al.,
Appellants,
367 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman W. McMahon,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 18th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Tulsa et al.,
Appellants,
421 vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company
et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Bowling et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
Frank Beaver et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

236

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Mrs. Abi Janney.

In error to the Court of Appeal, Second Circuit, of the State of Louisiana.

144

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal, Second Circuit, of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. duPont,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Cornelius R. Miller, as Director of Public Works and Buildings, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

186

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, for failure to apply for the writ of error in time as required by section 6 of the Act of September 6, 1916, c. 448, 39 Stat. 727.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daisy M. Scott et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

48 vs. In error to the Supreme Court

The City of Columbus, Ohio. of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Arkansas River Gas Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court

197 vs. of the State of Kansas.

Board of County Commissioners of

Sedgwick County, Kansas, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stanley P. Hall et al.,

Administrators,

Appellants, Appeal from the United States Circuit

17 vs. Court of Appeals for the First

Alexander Chandler et al., Circuit.

Receivers.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prince Tyner,

Plaintiff in error,

23 vs.

Henry Buffington et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Apalachicola Land & Development Company,

Plaintiff in error,

43 vs.

W. A. McRae, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida, et al.

It is ordered that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Order Allowing certiorari.

Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

529 vs.

Donald Page et al., Administrators.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Order allowing certiorari.

James McDonald, Jr., et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

555 vs.

Lawrence Maxwell et al., Executors.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
550 vs.
Stone & Downer Company et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company,
Petitioner,
604 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl Franz Adolph Otto Ingenohl,
Petitioner,
614 vs.
Walter E. Olsen & Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Casualty Company et al.,
Petitioners,
335 vs.
Alfred W. Agee, Administrator.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the order of June 8th, 1925, granting a writ of certiorari herein, be, and the same is hereby, revoked, because of the receipt of a certified copy of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Utah in the case of Carter vs. Standard Accident Insurance Company.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Casualty Company, et al., Petitioners,
335 vs.
Alfred M. Agee, Administrator.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas E. Buford, Petitioner,
395 vs.
North American Accident Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

N. M. Baldwin, Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben Chafin,

Petitioner,

460 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guiseppe Napolitano,

Petitioner,

466 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,

474 vs.

S. L. Jarrett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Scheuer et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
475 vs.
St. Paul Fire & Marine
Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Montana,
Petitioner,
476 vs.
Sunburst Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Salvadore Larrocca,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
C. J. Everett, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of the Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pan-American Bank & Trust Company
et al., Petitioners,
479 vs.
National City Bank of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant,
Petitioner,
483 vs.
William Clabaugh et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

C. H. Hodgkinson,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. M. Withers,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
William E. White, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. M. Withers,
Petitioner,
486 vs.
William E. White, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Withers Bros.,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
William E. White, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Withers Bros.,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
William E. White, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Chapman, Commissioner of Banking of the State of Texas et al.,
Petitioners,
489 vs.
H. M. Clayton, Jr., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Smelting & Refining Company, Petitioner,
490 vs.
George Campbell Carson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmond C. Fletcher,
Petitioner,
492 vs.
Percy Kellogg, Executor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman Peterson,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
511 vs.
John G. Winston Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
514 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Ellen Dickson et al.,
Petitioners,
516 vs.
A. C. Neal et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. M. McColgan,
Petitioner,
524 vs.
Charles H. Clark.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Sanday et al.,
Petitioners,
533 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Automobile Accessories Company, Petitioner,
527 vs.
Jerome H. Remick Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William F. Falligan, Petitioner,
530 vs.
Citizens Trust & Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Herr, Petitioner,
531 vs.
Citizens Trust & Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Giorgio Borelli, as Administrator,

Petitioner,

532 vs.

International Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pullman Company,

Petitioner,

534 vs.

Jacob S. Waln et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Domenico Lazzaro,

Petitioner,

537 vs.

Luther Weedin, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Sedgwick,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
Thomas E. Wing, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Charles Tittle.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kock Shing,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kook Tung,

Petitioner,

541 vs.

John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfred T. White,

Petitioner,

542 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Skipitar,

Petitioner,

544 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mississippi Central Railroad
Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
545 vs.
Ernest Knight.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
ex rel. Wilbur H. Rock,
Petitioner,
547 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph et al.,
Commissioners etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isadore Luvisch,
Petitioner,
560 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
American Trust Company, Guardian etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fannie B. Jones et al., Administrators, Petitioners,
569 vs.
Pearl Mosier et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Ann Parramore et al., etc., Petitioners,
571 vs.
The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. D. Kynerd,

Petitioner,

572 vs.

John A. Hulen, Receiver etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leong Don,

Petitioner,

573 vs.

William T. Christy, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mystic Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

575 vs.

Diamond-O Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William F. Young,
Petitioner,
576 vs.
J. E. Stillwell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Martin Jones, Jr.,
Petitioner,
577 vs.
Thomas Midgley et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman Mielke,
Petitioner,
581 vs.
James Schermerhorn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. K. Eysenbach et al.,
Petitioners,
583 vs.
Sammie Maharkey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Dail, Trustee etc.,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
H. A. Hart & Brother.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Schechter,
Petitioner,
586 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. S. McCray,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
Sapulpa Petroleum Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here by, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Levin et al.,
Petitioners,
588 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
Howe Totten.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick M. Littleton,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Troy Laundry Machinery Company, Limited, Petitioner,
600 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Road District No. 4 of Shelby County, Texas, Petitioner,
602 vs.
Home Bank and Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of South Houston et al., Petitioners,
605 vs.
John L. Carman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship "Sagaporack", Petitioner,
607 vs.
Norfolk Dredging Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar P. Bledsoe, County Treasurer of Comanche County, Oklahoma, Petitioner,
748 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief on behalf of the United States as amicus curiae.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
493 vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., and Sadie M. Robbins, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of R. D. Robbins, etc.

On motion of Mr. A. T. Vogelsang in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John C. Altman and Richard S. Goldman as amici curiae.

Edgar P. Bledsoe, County Treasurer of Comanche County, Oklahoma, Petitioner,
748 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. A. R. Williams in behalf of the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief herein in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari on or before the 19th instant.

Mashie Berenson, Petitioner,
744 vs.
H. C. Vogel Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Mr. Francis P. Garland for the petitioner, ten days' extension of time granted within which to serve printed record.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., Petitioners,
80 vs.
Benjamin Guinness, Walter T. Rosen, Moritz Rosenthal et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. Bernard Hershkopf, Mr. William D. Guthrie, Mr. Lewis R. Conklin, and Mr. Isidor J. Kresel in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief as amici curiae.

St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Company, Apellant,
465 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. Charles W. Bunn, Mr. L. B. da Ponte, and Mr. Dennis P. Lyons for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Benjamin S. Grosscup for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The Bank of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
746 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark E. Guerin for the respondent.

Coast Steamship Company and Dimon Line, Inc., Petitioner,
747 vs.
William S. Brady.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Rich for the petitioners, and by Mr. Palmer Pillans for the respondent.

Edgar P. Bledsoe, County Treasurer of Comanche County, Oklahoma, Petitioner,
748 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Dudley for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. T. Miller, Mr. C. B. Stuart, Mr. J. F. Sharp and Mr. M. K. Cruce for the respondent.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Salt Lake County et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray Van Cott for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Jensen for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation,
Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. J. R. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., Mr. Seiforde M. Stellwagen, Mr. Wm. C. Mahaffy, Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Moorfield Storey for the appellee.

Apalachicola Land & Development Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
43 vs.
W. A. McRae, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, pursuant to the 25d rule, by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. E. Tillman Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Rivers Buford and Mr. Fred T. Myers for the defendants in error.

Marianna Matthews,
Plaintiff in error,
39 vs.
Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer etc.
Mortimer Matthews,
Plaintiff in error,
40 vs.
Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mortimer Matthews for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles S. Bell for the defendant in error.

James C. Davis, Agent Provided for by the Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,

32 vs.

L. D. Alexander and Frank Griffith.

This cause was argued by Mr. William F. Collins for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Fred E. Suits for the respondents.

The State of New York on the relation of the Woodhaven Gas Light Company, Plaintiff in error,

33 vs.

The Public Service Commission of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Edward M. Deegan in that behalf leave was granted to file a motion to dismiss herein within one week, with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file an answer thereto and affidavits within one week thereafter.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. A. Dykman for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Edward M. Deegan for the defendant in error, by Mr. J. A. Dykman for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward M. Deegan for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. J. A. Dykman for the plaintiff in error.

Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian et al., Appellants,

34 vs.

Edwin W. Poe, Stuart S. Janney, Ernest J. Clark, et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Daniel O. Hastings for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Stuart S. Janney and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Emma M. Gillett, It is ordered that S. Helen Eisenhardt and Scotia Stark Haggerty, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ethan B. Stroud, Jr., It is ordered that Alexander White Spence, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al., Appellants,
49 vs.
The Arkansas Valley Interurban Railway Company.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian et al., Appellants,
34 vs.
Edwin W. Poe et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the appellant

Frank L. Smith et al.,
Appellants,
35 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone
Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. A. Foster for the appellants, continued by Mr. Charles M. Bracelen and Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. S. A. Foster for the appellants.

Central Union Telephone
Company, Plaintiff in error,
37 vs.
The City of Edwardsville, Illinois.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William D. Bangs for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Harry B. Stilz,
Appellant,
38 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry B. Stilz pro se.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence C. Fowler, It is ordered that James A. Beha, Esquire, of New York City, of the State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that William E. Brooks, Esquire, of Miami, State of Arizona, and John W. Murphy, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Henry, It is ordered that Philip S. Hopkins, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry B. Stilz,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John W. Loveland for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Harry B. Stilz, pro se.

Samuel Freshman,
Petitioner,
41 vs.
W. S. Atkins.

This cause was argued by Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.

Southern Electric Company,
Plaintiff in error,
42 vs.
Francis R. Stoddard, Jr., Superintendent, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur F. Gotthold, Mr. Thomas M. Fields, Mr. Frank J. Hogan, and Mr. Walter W. Gross for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. C. Fowler, Mr. James A. Beha, and Mr. Alfred C. Bennett for the defendant in error.

Concrete Appliances Company et al.,
Petitioners,
44 vs.
John E. Gomery et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. J. Cox for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. George B. Jones for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, It is ordered that Otis James Baughn, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Kansas City Structural Steel Company, Plaintiff in error,
54 vs.
The State of Arkansas for the use and benefit of Ashley County.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper, Mr. Charles T. Coleman, and Mr. J. W. House, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. R. Wilson for the defendant in error.

John B. Macken et al., Plaintiffs in error.
56 vs.
The City of Waterbury.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
57 vs.
Charles W. Reed and Dora
Reed, his wife.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. V. Knykendall for the respondents.

Concrete Appliances Company
et al., Petitioners,
44 vs.
John E. Gomery et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George B. Jones for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the petitioners.

M. Frank Donohue,
Plaintiff in error,
45 vs.
The State of Maine.
Frank C. Power,
Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
The State of Maine.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Wheeler for the defendant in error. No brief filed for the plaintiff in error.

Fleischman Construction Company
et al., Plaintiffs in error,
50 vs.
The United States of America to the
use of C. W. Forsburg et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Levi H. David for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the defendants in error.

The Buckeye Coal and Railway
Company et al., Appellants,
51 vs.
The Hocking Valley Railway
Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William C. Henderson for the appellants, continued by Mr. John F. Wilson and Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt for the appellees and concluded by Mr. William Burry for the appellants.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1925 - CONTINUED.

Iver Olbers,

Plaintiff in error,

52 vs.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clifford W. Mason, It is ordered that Arthur J. Brosseau, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Meserve, It is ordered that Martin Croissant, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. G. Foster, It is ordered that Everett E. Kent, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John W. Stephenson, et al.,
Appellants,
58 vs.
H. L. Kirtley et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Knight and Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the appellants, and by Mr. J. H. McClintic for the appellees.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1925 - CONTINUED.

Iver Olbers,
Plaintiff in error,
52 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the plaintiff in error.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
53 vs.
George C. Daniel.

This cause was argued by Mr. Blair Foster for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.

Old Dominion Land Company,
Plaintiff in error,
55 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Winston Read for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Thomas H. Willcox for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin D. Adams, It is ordered that E. C. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Miami, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Horace Sloan, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice W. Stoffer, It is ordered that Milton P. Firestone, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe, It is ordered that John M. Daniel, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., It is ordered that Harry LeBaron Sampson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Williams, It is ordered that John O. Collins, Esquire, of Ancon, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Thomas E. Rhodes, Esquire, and Cyril Wesley McClean, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Biddle, It is ordered that Anthony P. Nugent, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Terrence Druggan,

Appellant,

415 vs.

Palmer E. Anderson, United States Marshal, etc., and Wesley Westbrook, Superintendent of Cook County Jail of Cook County, Illinois.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Norman S. Bowles,
Appellant,
554 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, and to admit appellant to bail,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
The State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division one, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Murphy, Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al.,
Appellants,
18 vs.
A. Sardell.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Holmes requests that it be stated that his concurrence is solely upon the ground that he regards himself bound by the decision in Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 261 U. S. 525.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Apalachicola Land & Development Company et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

43 vs.

W. A. McRae, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank L. Smith et al.,

Appellants,

35 vs.

Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Frank Donohue,

Plaintiff in error,

45 vs.

The State of Maine.

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Power,
Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
The State of Maine.

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yu Cong Eng and Co Liam,
for themselves and for the
benefit of other persons
similarly situated and effected,
Petitioners,
623 vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector of
Internal Revenue, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth F. Shukert et al.,
Executrices of the Estate of
Gustave E. Shukert, deceased,
Petitioner,
653 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of
Internal Revenue for the District
of Nebraska.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Seeman et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
680 vs.
Philadelphia Warehouse Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Clarence Y. Hope, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Fred A. Elder.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Rhea,
Petitioner,
686 vs.
Thomas C. Smith.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Robert L. Massel,
Petitioner,
694 vs.
Foundation Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carter Lynch, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Tennessee River Coal Company,
Plaintiff in error,
310 vs.
Nashville, Chattanooga & St.Louis Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Scott,
Plaintiff in error,
455 vs.
Morris National Bank of Morris.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
617 vs.
Frank Sanders.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lewis & Conger et al.,
Petitioners,
618 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. William Levinson,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Mead Fibre Company,
Petitioner,
620 vs.
W. H. Varn et al., Copartners as Varn Brothers Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. Blattner, doing business as United Produce Company,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
A. H. Lemborn et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Seattle,
Petitioner,
627 vs.
Puget Sound Power & Light Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William E. Moore et al.,
Petitioners,
632 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J.H. Bunnell & Company, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
633 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Moore et al.,
Petitioners,
637 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lawrence Moore Byerly,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Sour Lake et al.,
Petitioners,
639 vs.
Vernon H. Branch.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Unversagt,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Unverzagt,
Petitioner,
vs.
E. B. Benn, as United States Marshal for the Western District of Washington.

641 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pinkie E. Moore et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
Lincoln Hospital Association et al.

642 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pierce Wrapping Machine Company,
Petitioner,
643 vs.
Terkelsen Machine Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Fisheries Products Company et al., Receivers of the Fisheries Products Company,
Petitioners,
644 vs.
Abraham S. Soe & Depew, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Owen Squier,
Petitioner,
656 vs.
American Telephone & Telegraph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Olof L. Bruce et al.,
Petitioners,
657 vs.
Dudley K. Woodworth, Jr., as Receiver of the Northern Oil and Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Petroleum Iron Works Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
Willis C. Wright.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. M. (Bee) Adams et al.,
Petitioners,
660 vs.
The State of Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Iron & Metal Company,

Petitioner,

661 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. Stoneham,

Petitioner,

664 vs.

Walter A. Clifford et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert H. Benhard et al.,

Petitioners,

720 vs.

Charles A. Stoneham.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Browning,

Petitioner,

665 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
666 vs.
John T. Diederich, Administrator of the Estate of Leonard Callihan, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. P. Black et al., Petitioners,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company, Petitioner,
668 vs.
Simon Theoktistou.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Ellenberg,

Petitioner,

669 vs.

Birmingham Belt Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael T. Naughton,

Petitioner,

671 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman T. Whitaker,

Petitioner,

672 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte Ernest Stoffregen,
Petitioner,
673

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America at the relation of The Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al., Petitioners,
676 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sugarland Industries et al.,
Petitioners,
677 vs.
Old Colony Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmond Van Dyk,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
William A. Young.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob L. Fisher et al.,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
James F. A. Clark et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. J. Fitzgerald,
Petitioner,
685 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman D. Ruhm,
Petitioner,
688 vs.
Herschel C. Ogden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Fire Extinguisher Company, Petitioner,
689 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas McDonnell,
Petitioner,
690 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Washington Market Company,
Petitioner,
691 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eberhart Steel Products Company,

Petitioner,

695 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, the 26th instant, until Monday, November 16th next.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

International- Great Northern Railroad Company,

Appellant,

344 vs.

John Roosevelt Sneed et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. R. M. Hudson, in behalf of Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.,

Petitioners,

80 vs.

Benjamin Guinness et al.

Benjamin Guinness et al.,

Petitioners,

81 vs.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

On motion of Mr. Amos J. Peaslee in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief as amici curiae and to make oral argument herein.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

On motion of Mr. Amos J. Peaslee in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Thomas G. Haight as amicus curiae.

J. O'Neal Sandel, as Administrator of the Personal Estate of Thelma Sandel, deceased, Plaintiff in error,
118 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Lumpkin and Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William N. Graydon in opposition thereto.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia, Appellants,
543 vs.
S. B. McNeely.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. P. Bullis for the appellants.

Victor Talking Machine Company, Petitioner,
761 vs.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company et al.

The motion to withhold the consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein until the petition in No. 775 is submitted, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. P. Brown in that behalf; and the motion was granted.

The United States, Appellant,
91 vs.
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Company.
The United States, Appellant,
92 vs.
The Wabash Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. Charles H. Bates in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief as amici curiae.

Road Improvement District No. 1 of Clark County, Arkansas, et al., Appellants,
19 vs.
Charles S. Thornton et al.

The motion to reinstate this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. J. Balzer in behalf of J. W. House, Jr., counsel for the appellants, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Julian C. Hammack, Mr. R. E. Wiley, and Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the appellees in opposition thereto.

The American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
752 vs.
The Springfield National Bank et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Booth and Mr. James I. Boulger for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. E. Bowman for the respondent in opposition thereto.

S. L. Leatherman et al., Petitioners,
754 vs.
A. J. Mayse et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Reilly and Mr. James G. Wilson for the petitioner.

Central of Georgia Railway Company, Petitioner,
755 vs.
Lillie May Davis, as Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Sadler, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred Fitz for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Meredith Hanna, Guardian of the Estate of Norris W. H. Haupt, a Minor, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting Annuities, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Meredith Hanna for the petitioner.

National Transit Company,
Petitioner,
759 vs.
James C. Davis, Director
General of Railroads.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Frank L. Crawford, Mr. Myron Harris, and Mr. Hugh C. Dorworth for the petitioner and by Mr. John E. Walker for the respondent.

Victor Talking Machine Company,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. William Clarke Mason, Mr. George W. Schurman, and Mr. William Houston Kenyon for the petitioner and by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. George W. Chase, Jr., for the respondent.

Robert S. Lee et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
155 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois
ex rel. Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary
of State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merchants Mutual Automobile
Liability Insurance Company
of Buffalo, New York,
Plaintiff in error,
300 vs.
Phoebe M. Bennett, as Administratrix etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Mary Strup,
Appellant,
321 vs.
George Williams, Criminal Sheriff for the Parish of Orleans, Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henderson-Waits Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error,
519 vs.
W. F. Croft, for the use and benefit of the First National Bank of De Funiak Springs, Florida.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Rose,
Plaintiff in error,
66 vs.
The State of South Dakota.

On motion of Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in that behalf, this cause was continued, per stipulation.

Clara Showalter,
Plaintiff in error,
72 vs.
Georgia Valliere Hampton.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Herbert H. McCluer for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana et al.,
Appellants,
59 vs.
The United States of America.
Mrs. Lydia Hanszen McMullen et al.,
Appellants,
60 vs.
The United States of America.

These cases were argued by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellants, and by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellee.

Louisville Bedding Company,
Appellant,
61 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Hudson Bay Knitting Company, Limited,
Appellant,
62 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

William Meier,
Plaintiff in error,
63 vs.
The State of Florida.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. C. Clark for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Rivers Buford for the defendant in error.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1925 - CONTINUED.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,

Appellant,

63 vs.

The City of Cleburne et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Washington Bowie, Jr., for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Gordon, It is ordered that Allan T. C. Gordon, Esquire; David I. McCahill, Esquire, and Edward O. Tabor, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burt W. Andrews, It is ordered that Wesley F. Pape, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
James Daugherty.

On motion of Mr. A. P. Nugent in that behalf, leave was granted to substitute A. P. Nugent as counsel for the respondent.

Carrie E. Hawley,
Plaintiff in error,
78 vs.
The State of Iowa.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,

Appellant,

64 vs.

The City of Cleburne et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Washington Bowie, Jr., for the appellant, by Mr. Alexander W. Spence and Mr. Ethan B. Stroud, Jr., for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Washington Bowie, Jr., for the the appellant.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

65 vs.

New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the respondent.

Burk-Waggoner Oil Association,

Plaintiff in error,

67 vs.

George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of Texas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry C. Weeks for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Bernabe Africa, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Director General, and Agent, etc.,
Petitioner,
79 vs.
John L. Roper Lumber Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin and Mr. R. M. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. M. Blair for the respondent.

J. Edmund Michael,
Appellant,
82 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Burk-Waggoner Oil Association,
Plaintiff in error,
67 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of Texas.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. C. Weeks for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Arnold H. Baar for the plaintiff in error.

Lipshitz & Cohen, a Partnership, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
68 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. A. Alexander for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Joseph Hodgson,
Plaintiff in error,
69 vs.
The Midwest Oil Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. M. Hodgson for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The People's Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.
The People's Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
71 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. J. E. B. Cunningham for the defendant in error, The City of Johnstown, and by Mr. F. M. Hunter for the plaintiff in error.

67 v. 2

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that Byrd Earle White, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that James J. Cosgrove, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., petitioners,
80 vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.
Benjamin Guinness et al. petitioners,
81 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

On motion of Mr. John W. Davis in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of The Guaranty Trust Company of New York as amicus curiae.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.,
Petitioners,
80 vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

On motion of Mr. William St. John Tozer in behalf of Mr. Charles E. Hughes, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Benjamin Guinness et al.,
Petitioners,
81 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

W. Carl Holloway,
Appellant,
85 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Schatz, Administrator of Michael H. Fisher,
Appellant,
84 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miles W. Gibbons,
Appellant,
86 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, of counsel for the appellee, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People's Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,

70 vs.

The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

The People's Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,

71 vs.

The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. M. Hunter for the defendant in error, the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and concluded by Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiff in error.

Live Oak Water Users' Association et al., Plaintiffs in error,

73 vs.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. S. Brittain for the Plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Carl I. Wheat for the defendants in error.

The State of Arkansas ex rel. J. S. Utley, Attorney General etc., Plaintiff in error,

74 vs.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Horace Sloan for the plaintiff in error and petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. Gordon Frierson, Mr. William J. Orr, Mr. Edward L. Westbrooke, and Mr. Edward T. Miller for the defendants in error and respondents.

United Gas & Electric Engineering Corporation, Appellant,

75 vs.

The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., petitioners,
80 vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

Benjamin Guinness et al., petitioners,
81 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alexander G. Seigel for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Harreld, It is ordered that Adelbert Brown, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander B. Siegel, It is ordered that Hamilton Vreeland, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Cummins, It is ordered that Henry Silwold, Esquire, of Newton, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean H. Stanley, It is ordered that Woodson W. Bercaw, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Lloyd Edwin Pollock, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix C. Davila, It is ordered that Arturo Reichard, Esquire, of Aguadilla, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon, It is ordered that Alida Smith, and David Oscar Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Lipshitz & Cohen, a Partnership, etc., plaintiff in error,
68 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to file an additional brief herein was submitted by Mr. Henry A. Alexander for the plaintiff in error, and the motion was denied.

Thorvald Berg et al., Appellants,
89 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Cooksey for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee.

Henry Albrecht, Senior et al., Plaintiffs in error,
90 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was continued on motion of Mr. Paul Christian in that behalf.

L. Littlejohn & Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
94 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was passed temporarily, on motion of Mr. J. Frank Staley in that behalf.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., petitioners,
80 vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

Benjamin Guinness et al., petitioners,
81 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alexander B. Siegel for Benjamin Guinness et al., by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for Carl Joerger et al., and concluded by Mr. Alexander B. Siegel for Benjamin Guinness et al.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, petitioner,
87 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. William H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Gwynn Gardiner, It is ordered that James A. Tobey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, It is ordered that Oscar A. Stephens, Esquire, of Warren, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Archibald C. Matteson, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Lawrence J. Kosters, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Edward M. Dangel, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Lobingier, It is ordered that Teodoro M. Kalaw, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Huston Thompson, Jr., It is ordered that Thomas H. Hood, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
53 vs.
George C. Daniel.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia, Appellants,
543 vs.
S. B. McNeely.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Road Improvement District No. 1 of Clark County, Arkansas et al., Appellants,
19 vs.
Charles S. Thornton et al.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause to the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. O'Neal Sandel, Administrator, Plaintiff in error,
118 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivars Olbers, Plaintiff in error,
52 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clara Showalter,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

72 vs. the State of Oklahoma.

Georgia Valliere Hampton.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville Bedding Company,

Appellant,

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

61 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hudson Bay Knitting

Company, Limited,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

62 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, and that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Meier,

Plaintiff in error,

63 vs.

The State of Florida.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,

Appellant,

64 vs.

The City of Cleburne et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Hodgson,

Plaintiff in error,

69 vs.

The Midwest Oil Company et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit upon the authority of the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Gas & Electric Engineering Corporation, Appellant,
75 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thorvald Berg et al.,
Appellants,
89 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
712 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
713 vs.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
714 vs.
Alfred Klesner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop", Hooper & Klesner.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
716 vs.
Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward F. Coltra,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
William F. Brims et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
725 vs.
Eastman Kodak Company et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ellamar Mining Company,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The Alaska Steamship Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al.,
Petitioners,
741 vs.
Attleboro Steam & Electric Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana & Western Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
494 vs.
John B. Gardiner.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Thigpen et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
495 vs.
Midland Oil Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago & Western Illinois Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
574 vs.
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer Railroad Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the appeal .

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastern Products Corporation et al.,
Petitioners,
394 vs.
Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merchants Bank & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
J. Frank Pflug et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Laura Smith, Administratrix etc.,
Petitioner,
452 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe H. Tiger,
Petitioner,
497 vs.
William M. Fewell et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Mebane, as Receiver,
Plaintiff in error,
509 vs.
Staten Island Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
C. G. Hendricks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Petitioner,
570 vs.
Louis Phillips et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Bristol County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Bristol County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willie Conner et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
621 vs.
H. U. Bartlett et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Gallagher et al.,
Appellants,
658 vs.
John E. Hannigan, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Pottash and Harry Pottash,
Copartners, etc.,
Petitioners,
703 vs.
Birds, Heilgers, Ironsides, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Underleider et al.,
Petitioners,
704 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Eick,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary C. H. Frenzer et al.,
Petitioners,
706 vs.
Arthur J. Frenzer, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ephraim A. Schwarzenberg,

Petitioner,

707 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Hadl,

Petitioner,

708 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Salvador Serra,

Petitioner,

709 vs.

The Estate of the Deceased Lazaro Mota et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Creamery Package Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. H. H. Miller Industries Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

711

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ng Lin Go, Petitioner, vs. Luther Weedin, as Commissioner of Immigration. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

715

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Buenaventura Lopez et al., Petitioners, vs. El Hogar Filipino, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

717

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
723 vs.
Hugh L. Britton, An Infant, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and ofthe argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Susquehanna Steamship Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
724 vs.
A. O. Anderson & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmond Fenstermacher,
Petitioner,
732 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
733 vs.
Richard Inglis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
Mary P. Charles.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
735 vs.
Howard L. Domigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
J. E. Brate.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Harter Bank,
Petitioner,
737 vs.
Mrs. F. U. LeMay.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles DeWitt,
Petitioner,
742 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mashie Berenson,

Petitioner,

744 vs.

H. G. Vogel Company, Inc.,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick O'Donoghue,

Petitioner,

745 vs.

Mary Jaeger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bank of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,

746 vs.

Wenceslao Trinidad, Collector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Coast Steamship Company et al.,
Petitioners,
747 vs.
William S. Brady.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar P. Bledsoe, County Treasurer etc.,
Petitioner,
748 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Salt Lake County, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
752 vs.
The Springfield National Bank et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central of Georgia Railway Company, Petitioner,
755 vs.
Lillie May Davis, as Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Meredith Hanna, Guardian of the Estate of Morris W. H. Haupt, a Minor, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The Pennsylvania Company for Insurance of Lives and Granting of Annuities, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Transit Company,
Petitioner,
759 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick Joyce,
Appellant,
140 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Kelly and Frank W. Sullivan, Co-parters etc.,
appellants,
85 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War of the United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Eugene West in that behalf, It is ordered that Dwight W. Davis, present Secretary of War, be, and he hereby is, substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
14 Original vs.
The State of New York et al.

On motion of Mr. Clarence P. Mosier in behalf of the defendants, it is ordered that complainant have the record printed on or before January 1st next, and the cause set for hearing on Monday, March 1st next.

In re: Disbarment of
John H. Adriaans,
Horace L. B. Atkisson,
L. Grandin Grossman,
Henry E. Bolt,
Walter Holland.

The motion for the disbarment of John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, Henry E. Bolt, and Walter Holland was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

In re: Disbarment of
Norman T. Whitaker.

The motion for the disbarment of Norman T. Whitaker was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

William H. Edwards, Collector,
Petitioner,
129 vs.
Archibald Douglas et al.

On motion of Mr. Paul Armitage in behalf of the respondents, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief herein, with leave to counsel for the petition to file a reply thereto.

Joseph Wheless,
Petitioner,
769 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Courtof Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Wheless for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. William M. Offley for the respondents.

New Orleans Public Belt Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
738 vs.
James Davis.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Gleason in behalf of the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Percy S. Benedict for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Interstate Refineries, Inc.,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Kaw Boiler Works Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, It is ordered that Ralph W. Rymer, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy H. Moore, It is ordered that Max Ash, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles William Freeman, It is ordered that Ralph Emmons Courtnage, Esquire, of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Alexander Goodman, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Watkins, It is ordered that J. R. Moore, Esquire, of Archer City, State of Texas, and Charles K. Walsh, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Edward C. Craig, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Lyman R. Critchfield, Esquire, of Wooster, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Robert R. Jackson, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that B. W. Griffith, Jr., Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, It is ordered that Monte Appel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Concrete Appliances Company and
William H. Insley,
Petitioners,
44 vs.
John E. Gomery, John C. Schwartz,
Michael J. O'Meara et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The State of Arkansas ex rel. J. S. Utley, Attorney General etc.,

Plaintiff in error,

74 vs.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company and Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

George H. Beazell,

Plaintiff in error,

247 vs.

The State of Ohio and William H. Chatfield, Jr.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

William H. Chatfield, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
248 vs.
The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

John W. Stephenson, Emma Thomson, Jennie Stephenseon et al.,
Appellants,
58 vs.
H. L. Kirtley, H. W. Herold, and F. E. Cawley.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
2 Original vs.
The State of Tennessee.

The opinion of the Court in this cause was announced by Mr. Justice Butler. The exceptions to the report of the Commissioners are overruled and the report of the Commissioners is confirmed. The cost of printing the evidence is to be paid by defendant. All other expenses, including Commissioners' compensation, are to be divided equally between the parties. A suggested form of decree may be submitted by the parties within forty days to carry the provisions of this opinion into effect.'

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Harry B. Stilz,

Appellant,

38 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Kansas City Structural Steel Company, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court

54 vs. of the State of Arkansas.

The State of Arkansas for the use and benefit of Ashley County.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Stone.

James C. Davis, Director General and Agent, etc., On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

Petitioner, Court of Appeals of the State of

79 vs. Virginia.

John L. Roper Lumber Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Clarence A. Anderson,
331 vs.
James W. Clune.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana,
B. R. Morvell, A. E. Weaver, et al., Appellants,
59 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mrs. Lydia Hanszen McMullen,
H. Earl Barnes, Dillard P. Eubank, et al., Appellants,
60 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Samuel Freshman,
Petitioner,
41 vs.
W.S. Atkins.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Anna Woerishoffer and Lewis Cass Ledyard, as Executrix and Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Oswald Ottendorfer, deceased,
Appellants,
11 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James C. Davis, Agent Provided for by the Transportation Act, 1920, Petitioner, vs. L. D. Alexander and Frank Griffith.

32

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, and Munich Reinsurance Company, Appellants, vs. Edwin W. Poe, Stuart S. Janney, Ernest J. Clark, et al., etc.

34

It is ordered by this Court that Frederick C. Hicks, present Alien Property Custodian, be, and he is hereby, substituted in the place and stead of Thomas W. Miller, resigned, as a party appellant herein.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, and Munich Reinsurance Company, Appellants, vs. Edwin W. Poe, Stuart S. Janney, Ernest J. Clark, et al., etc.

34

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Burk-Waggoner Oil Association,
Plaintiff in error,
67 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of Texas.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Lipshitz & Cohen, a Partnership Composed of Berel S. Lipshitz and Morris Cohen, Plaintiff in error,
68 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Joseph P. Margolin,
Petitioner,
254 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al., Appellants,
184 vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in error,
24 vs.
The State of Georgia, as Owner of Western & Atlantic Railroad, and Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, as Lessee, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Old Dominion Land Company,

Plaintiff in error, vs. The United States of America. In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

55

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, Petitioners, vs. Benjamin Guinness, Walter T. Rosen, et al., etc. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

80

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Benjamin Guinness, Walter T. Rosen, Moritz Rosenthal, et al., etc., Petitioners,

81 vs.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, and Carl Joerger, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, as to interest; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Arthur E. Donegan, Appellant,

185 vs.

B. E. Dyson, United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Coal and Railway Company and The Sunday Creek Coal Company,

Appellants,

51 vs.

The Hocking Valley Railway Company, Central Union Trust Company of New York, and The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

In re:

Disbarment of John H. Adriaans.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that John H. Adriaans be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said John H. Adriaans to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said John H. Adriaans be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:

Disbarment of Horace L. B. Atkisson.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that Horace L. B. Atkisson be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said Horace L. B. Atkisson to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said Horace L. B. Atkisson be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:

Disbarment of L. Grandin Grossman.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that L. Grandin Grossman be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said L. Grandin Grossman to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said L. Grandin Grossman be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:

Disbarment of Henry E. Bolt.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that Henry E. Bolt be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said Henry E. Bolt to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said Henry E. Bolt be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:

Disbarment of Walter Holland.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that Walter Holland be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said Walter Holland to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said Walter Holland be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:

Disbarment of Norman T. Whitaker.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia that Norman T. Whitaker be forthwith suspended from practice before this Court, and of the motion that a rule issue directing the said Norman T. Whitaker to show cause why he should not be disbarred from practice as a Member of the Bar of this Court.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said Norman T. Whitaker be, and he is hereby, required to show cause, within thirty days, why he should not be disbarred and his name stricken from the roll of Attorneys and Counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Company, Appellant, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company.

465

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Scott Barker, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

807

Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Application for further proceedings herein in forma pauperis is denied, for the reason that the Court, having examined the typewritten record and having found the petition for writ of certiorari without merit, hereby denies the same.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar S. Appleby et al., Executors etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The City of New York et al.

15

Edgar S. Appleby et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of Docks of the City of New York.

16

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument, and assigned for Monday, January 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Collector,
129 vs.
Archibald Douglas et al.,
Executors.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of George Wellwood Murray et al., herein, as amici curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seward K. Lowe et al.,
Petitioners,
580 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

Order Allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy Fisher,
Plaintiff in error,
459 vs.
H. J. Crider.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. J. Schwaub & Sons, Inc.,
Petitionar,
469 vs.
Tennessee Egg Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Engineering Company,
Plaintiff in error,
662 vs.
White, Gratwick & Mitchell, Inc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dr. B. W. Crabb,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Warren H. Kerby et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. L. Leatherman et al.,
Petitioners,
754 vs.
A. J. Mayse et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Wheless,
Petitioner,
769 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Alexander Milburn Company,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Davis-Bournonville Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Ephraim Lederer, Formerly Collector,
120 vs.
Mary A.McCarvey, Executrix.
The United States of America,
790 vs.
John E. Zerbey et al.

Motion to advance No. 790 for hearing with No. 120, and to assign the cases for argument on March 1st next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of Ephraim Lederer, Formerly Collector, and The United States of America.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.,
Appellants,
136 vs.
George Arthur Clausen et al.

It is ordered by this Court that Frederick C. Hicks, present Alien Property Custodian, be, and he is hereby, substituted in the place and stead of Thomas W. Miller, resigned, as a party appellant herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian et al.,
Appellants,
136 vs.
George Arthur Clausen et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., Appellants,

392 vs.

Adolph J. Becker.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,

712 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector.

William H. Edwards, Collector, Petitioner,

804 vs.

New York Life Insurance Company.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf.

William H. Edwards, Collector, Petitioner,

129 vs.

Archibald Douglas et al., Executors.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of the petitioner leave was granted to file an answer to the brief of George Wellwood Murray et al., herein, as amici curiae, within five days.

Ex parte: In the matter of
The State of Maryland,
23 Original. Petitioner.
Ex parte: In the matter of
The State of Maryland,
24 Original. Petitioner.
Ex Parte: In the matter of
The State of Maryland,
25 Original. Petitioner.

The returns to the rules to show cause filed; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
13 Original vs.
The State of Texas,
The United States Intervener.

Order.

The boundary commissioners having this day presented their third report showing further compliance with the decree of March 12, 1923, and particularly that they have run, located and marked upon the ground portions of the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma from the one hundredth meridian of longitude to the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, other than the Big Bend and Fort Augur Areas covered by two reports heretofore presented and confirmed;

It is ordered that the report be filed and that the parties have thirty days from this date within which severally to present any objections which they may have to the report.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Patterson, doing business as J. W. Patterson Commission Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
221 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.

The petition for rehearing to correct the judgment, and motion to stay the mandate herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson in that behalf.

The New York & Porto Rico
Steamship Company,
Appellant,
411 vs.
Rafael Cintron Lastra et al.,
etc.

Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,
Appellant,
102 vs.
The United States.
The Firm of M. Jebsen, etc.,
et al., Appellants,
103 vs.
The United States.
Hamburg-American Line Terminal
& Navigation Company,
Appellant,
108 and 109 vs.
The United States.
Atlas Line Steamship Company,
Appellant,
110 and 111 vs.
The United States.
North German Lloyd,
Appellant,
112,113 and 114 vs.
The United States.
Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt,
Aktien-Gesellschaft (also known as
Hamburg-American Line),
Appellants,
116 and 117 vs.
The United States.
Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs-
Gesellschaft, Appellant,
126 vs.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald King for the appellees in support of the motion and by Mr. Ray Reed Allen for the appellants in opposition thereto.

On motion of Mr. Charles H. LeFevre in that behalf, these cases were continued per stipulation.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator.

The motion to dismiss or to place this cause upon the Summary Docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. T. Ronning in behalf of Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Thomas D.O'Brien, Mr. Edward S. Stringer, and Mr. Daniel Taylor for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Fred A. Elder.

Mrs. Ida Hughes,
Plaintiff in error,
739 vs.
The State of Georgia.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Jackson for the plaintiff in error; counsel to file, within thirty days, statement of grounds relied upon to show jurisdiction of this Court.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
-- Original vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Woodruff and Mr. William A. Schnader for the complainant.

Leonard Metcalf et al., Partners etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
183 vs.
John J. Mitchell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Massachusetts.
(and)

On motion of Mr. Lewis M. Isaacs in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Emma B. Brunner, as Executrix of the Estate of Arnold W. Brunner, deceased, as amicus curiae.

John J. Mitchell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Massachusetts,

Plaintiff in error,

376 vs.

Leonard Metcalf et al., Partners etc.

The motion for leave to apply to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York to vacate the order complained of by the petitioner was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. H. Potter in behalf of Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

The United States,

Appellant,

93 vs.

Lucia E. Blount, Administratrix, etc.

On motion of Mr. E. W. Wilson in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Edmund L. Mooney herein as amicus curiae.

The United States,

Appellant,

93 vs.

Lucia E. Blount, Administratrix, etc.

On motion of Mr. Frederick L. Fishback in behalf of Mr. Elihu Root, Jr., leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Jacob Joseph Tutun,

762 vs.

The United States.

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Cobb in behalf of Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Louis Marshall for Jacob Joseph Tutun.

Durez Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

238 vs.

Bakelite Corporation.

The United States,
Appellant,
337 vs.
P. Chauncey Anderson et al.

On motion of Mr. Monte Appel in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Worcester Pressed Steel Company herein as amicus curiae.

The United States,
Appellant,
420 vs.
The Yale & Town Manufacturing Company.

General American Tank Car Corporation et al.,
Appellants,
162 vs.
Eudora S. Day, Sheriff.

The Motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B.Pettus in behalf of Mr. Harry P. Sneed for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edwin T. Merrick for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Cattina Sala,
Plaintiff in error,
356, October Term, 1924,
vs.
A.A. Crane et al.

On motion of Mr. Dale D.Drain in that behalf, leave was granted to withdraw from the record in this case, original land patent, marked "Exhibit A", upon filing a duplicate copy thereof with the clerk of this Court.

Hattie Rowe,
Plaintiff in error,
276 vs.
Robert L. Sartain et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. W. Griffith, Jr., Mr. C. B. Ames, Mr. John Ladner, Mr. E. T. Noble, and Mr. A. D. Cochran for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John Tomerling for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnburg, et al., Petitioner,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amos J. Peaslee for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Grant for the respondent.

Burnrite Coal Briquette Company, Petitioner,
768 vs.
Edward G. Riggs et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merritt Lane for the respondent.

Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining and Concentrating Company et al., Petitioners,
771 vs.
Jacob Polak.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Beals for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lawrence H. Brown for the respondent.

Roxana Petroleum Corporation, Petitioner,
772 vs.
Robert Watchorn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Truman Post Young and Mr. John H. Carroll for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Morgan for the respondent.

J. S. Bache & Company, Petitioner,
773 vs.
Thomas W. Hinds, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, Mr. Helm Bruce, and Mr. Henry Hoelman for the

petitioner, and by Mr. Colin C. H. Pyffe and Mr. William W. Spalding for the respondents.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Steamship Poznan, etc.,.et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. Mark W. McClay for the respondents.

Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company et al.,
Petitioners,
775 vs.
Victor Talking Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. George W. Case, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. William Houston Kenyon, and Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondent.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself, etc.,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, their members etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick Clayton Peterson for the respondent.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Terry & Tench Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the petitioner.

Banner Milling Company,
Petitioner,
779 vs.
The State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the respondent.

Meyer E. Kaplan et al.,
Petitioners,
780 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob J. Pedell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Swift & Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by by Mr. Albert H. Veeder, Mr. Henry Veeder, and Mr. James M. Sheean for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company et al.,
Petitioners,
783 vs.
Jacob Kriger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clinton H. McKay, Mr. Charles M. Burch, Mr. H. D. Minor, Mr. H. S. Marx, and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner.

Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners,
Petitioner,
784 vs.
Holbrook, Cabot & Rollins Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Frederic M. P. Pearse for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Griggs, Mr. John W. Harding, Mr. Thomas F. Conway, Mr. Joseph A. Kellogg, and Mr. Thomas E. O'Brien for the respondent.

The United States Sugar Equalization Board, Inc.,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
P. DeRonde & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., and Mr. Charles F. Curley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. Richards and Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield for the respondent.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.,
petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
296 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
297 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
298 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Alexander Sedgwick,
Plaintiff in error,
562 vs.
Thomas E. Wing, Trustee.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip W. Russell and Mr. Burt D. Whedon for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Hector M. Hitchings and Mr. Hugh W. Ogden for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Harry Glassman,
Petitioner,
8 vs.
Robert C. Rand, Temporary Receiver of Herman Brenner and Jacob Branner, Individually and as Copartners, Trading as H. Brenner & Company, Bankrupts.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that a rule has been issued requiring the parties or their counsel to show cause why the writ of certiorari in this cause should not be dismissed; and that no return to the said rule to show cause has been filed,

Therefore, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft

Riley Smith,

Plaintiff in error,

13 vs.

The State of Nebraska.

In error to the Supreme Court of The State of Nebraska.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that a rule has been issued requiring the parties or their counsel to show cause why the writ of error in this cause should not be dismissed; and that no return to the said rule to show cause has been filed,

Therefore, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray A. Lower,

Plaintiff in error,

14 vs.

The State of Nebraska.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that a rule has been issued requiring the parties or their counsel to show cause why the writ of error in this cause should not be dismissed; and that no return to the said rule to show cause has been filed,

Therefore, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas,

Complainant,

15 Original vs.

The State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the complainant to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said bill of complaint be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
appellant,
91 vs.
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Company.

The United States,
appellant,
92 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant, continued by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the appellee in No. 91, and concluded by Mr. F. Carter Pope for the appellee in No. 92.

American Steel Foundries,
156 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, and Simplex Electric Heating Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the American Steel Foundries, and continued by Mr. Nathan Hurd for the Simplex Electric Heating Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hilary C. Stowell, It is ordered that William Bell Tippetts, Esquire, of Saint Petersburg, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul S. Andrews, It is ordered that Thomas Harold Greene, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Cummins, It is ordered that Edward Francis McMahon, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abbot P. Mills, It is ordered that Duane Richardson Dills, Esquire, of Pelham, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonard J. Mather, It is ordered that R. M. F. Soto, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

American Feature Film Company,
Appellant,
803 vs.
John H. Trumbull, Governor of the State of Connecticut et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Steel Foundries,
156 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Nathan Heard for Simplex Electric Heating Company, and concluded by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for American Steel Foundries.

H. P. Trusler,
Plaintiff in error,
188 vs.
Noah Crooks et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. R. Morrison for the plaintiff in error; and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Robert P. Reeder for the defendant in error.

Perry Browning et al.,
Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William H. Watkins for the appellants, continued by Mr. John H. Moore for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. C. K. Walsh for the appellants.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
F. S. Royster Guano Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Branch P. Kerfoot for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that John W. Creekmur, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Fred W. Dodson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that William V. Daly, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Edward Liddon Patterson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
30 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
P. S. Royster Guano Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Cadwallader J. Collins for the respondent in case No. 477, and concluded by Mr. Branch P. Kerfoot for the petitioner.

George D. Provost et al.,
Copartners, etc.,
Appellants,
258 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Henderson Water Company,
Appellant,
249 vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. H. Bridgers for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America,
208 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the United States, and continued by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for Jose Candelaria et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that Hyman Maurice Goldstein, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, It is ordered that J. Albert Toler, Esquire, of Mullens, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Elgin H. Blalock, Esquire, of Port Arthur, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Harry R. Wilson, Esquire, of Clarion, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
208 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for Jose Candelaria et al.

William O'Hara et al.,
Petitioners,
224 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Peter S. Carter for the respondent.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York, Plaintiff in error,
31 vs.
Southern Photo Materials Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Daniel McDougald for the defendant in error.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
275 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward C. Craig for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Port Gardner Investment Company,
611 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, on behalf of the United States, it is ordered that this cause be reassigned for hearing with case No. 475, as one case, on December 7th next.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
273 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward C. Craig for the petitioner, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Edward C. Craig for the petitioner.

The United States,
Appellant,
337 vs.
P. Chauncey Anderson et al.

The United States, Appellant,
420 vs.
The Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant, contined by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellees in No. 337, and concluded by Mr. Louis H. Porter for the appellee in No. 420.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Cornelius H. Bull, Esquire, and Thomas F. Baughman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Jacob Levy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that H. McClure Johnson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to theCourt in this behalf by Mr. James A. Cobb, It is ordered that James C. Waters, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that A. Arthur Jenkins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amasa M. Holcombe, It is ordered that Alva D. Adams, Esquire, and Charles F. Miller, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that Joseph J. Daniels, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Charles M. Thorp, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Karl E. Burr, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Malcolm W. McKenzie, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Kavanaugh, It is ordered that Roscoe C. Nelson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant, vs. The State of Louisiana. Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree awarding an injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by striking out the clause reading "and further restraining him, and them from making any disposition of said described lands or from taking any action affecting the same save such immediate steps as are necessary to the further and final recognition of plaintiff's rights under the Acts of March 2, 1849, (9 Stat. 352) and September 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519), to the end that evidence of title may be given to plaintiff as by said Acts provided and required"; and, thus modified, the decree of the said Court of Appeals is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The People of the State of New York on the Relation of the Woodhaven Gas Light Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The Public Service Commission of the State of New York. On consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The People of the State of New York on the Relation of the Woodhaven Gas Light Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The Public Service Commission of the State of New York. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error,
25 vs.
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Stone.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
129 vs.
Archibald Douglas, George Notman, and Edmund Coffin, as Executors of the Estate of James Douglas, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States,

Appellant,

29 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Boston Insurance Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Central Union Telephone Company,

Plaintiff in error,

37 vs. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

The City of Edwardsville, Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Electric Company,

Plaintiff in error,

42 vs. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,
790 vs.
John E. Zerbey et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with No. 120, on the regular docket, to be heard when No. 120 is reached.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Joseph Tutun
762 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Orleans Public Belt Railroad,
Plaintiff in error,
738 vs.
James Davis.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York & Porto Rico Steamship Company,

Appellant,

411 vs.

Rafael Cintron Lastra et al., etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

Hattie Rowe,

Plaintiff in error,

276 vs.

Robert L. Sartain et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General American Tank Car Corporation et al.,

Appellants,

168 vs.

Robert S. Day, Sheriff.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
296 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.

IT is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
297 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
298 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, Master etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
-- Original vs.
The State of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, January 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Durez Company,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
Bakelite Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to apply to the District Court to vacate the order entered in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg, Petitioner,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Coal Briquette Company,
Petitioner,
768 vs.
Edward G. Riggs et al.,
Receivers.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Steamship "Poznan", her Engines etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Talking Machine Company,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Terry and Tench Company, Inc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift & Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that a duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company et al., Petitioners,
783 vs.
Jacob Krieger.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Sugar Equalization Board, Petitioner, vs. P. DeRonde & Company, Inc.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted.

800

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Petitioners, vs. Mercantile Trust Company.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly

809

certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Mercantile Trust Company.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted.

810

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

The Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining and Concentrating Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Jacob Polak.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

771

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roxana Petroleum Corporation, Petitioner,
772 vs.
Robert Watchorn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. S. Bache & Company, Petitioner,
773 vs.
Thomas W. Hinde et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Victor Talking Machine Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Cornelius Andersen, etc.,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Banner Milling Company,
Petitioner,
779 vs.
The State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Meyer E. Kaplan et al.,
Petitioners,
780 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners,
Petitioner,
784 vs.
Holbrook, Cabot & Rollins
Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation.

On motion of Mr. George A. King in behalf of Mr. William M. Chadbourne, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of Missouri at the relation of and to the use of Wabash Railway Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
366 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Marriok for the defendants in error; with leave to Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the Wabash Railway Company to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

Hartsville Oil Mill,
Appellant,
609. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don F. Reed for the appellant.

Ex parte: In the matter of
Marcus Gruber, Petitioner.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A.Rae Williams for the petitioner.

Frank C. Bramwell, Superintendent of the Bank of the State of Oregon, Appellant,
192 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

On motion of Mr. T. D. McKeown in behalf of the Banking Department of the State of Oklahoma, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

International Stevedoring Company, Petitioner,
789 vs.
R. Haverty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the petitioner.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
792 vs.
Nellie Kidd, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther Burns, Mr. Henry S. Conrad, Mr. M. L. Bell, and Mr. W. F. Dickinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Platt Hubbell for the respondent.

John Russo, alias Massimino Pissanello, Petitioner,
793 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas E. Nolan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joab H. Banton and Mr. Felix C. Benvenga for the respondent.

Fred L. Kriebel, Petitioner,
795 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland and Mr. Robert N. Golding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Oscar R. Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
797 vs.
The City of Tacoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. W. Dynes and Mr. George W. Korte for the petitioner.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
802 vs.
Worthington & Company, a partnership etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the petitioner, and by Mr. Augustus Benner for the respondent.

William H. Edwards, Collector, Petitioner,
804 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner.

Leo A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
454 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Jerome Michael, and Mr. Henry Gale for the respondent.

Frank E. Stripe et al., Receivers, Petitioners,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben A. Matthews and Mr. Harold Harper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Jerome Michael, and Mr. Henry Gale for the respondent.

Frank C. Bramwell, Superintendent of the Bank of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
192 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation.

Three hours was allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. J. P. Kavanaugh for the appellant in No. 192, continued by Mr. Roscoe C. Nelson and Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellee in No. 192; by Mr. J. P. Kavanaugh for the appellant in No. 192; and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner in No. 503; and concluded by Mr. H. G. Pickering for the respondent in No. 503.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
181 vs.
Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. A. Harrigan for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, It is ordered that Richard B. Keech, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Magee, It is ordered that Morris D. Canter, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Lank, It is ordered that Harry F. Mela, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Philip F. Dodson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, It is ordered that Antony A. Wolfe, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Henderson Stockton, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ephraim Lederer, Formerly Collector etc.,
120 vs.
Mary A. McGarvey, Executrix, etc.
The United States of America,
790 vs.
John E. Zerbey et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the order heretofore entered on November 23d last advancing No. 790 for argument with No. 120, when the latter case is reached in the regular call of the docket, be, and the same is hereby, vacated. And it is further ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, consolidated and assigned for argument as one case on Monday, March 1, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of The Luis J. Bergdoll Motor Company,
Petitioner,
181 vs.
Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. A. Harrigan for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. W. B. Gibbons for the respondent.

The Federal Trade Commission et al.,
Appellants,
4 vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants, and by Mr. Paul D. Cravath for the appellees.

The United States,
Appellant,
288 vs.
Swift & Company.
Swift & Company,
Appellant,
289 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, Mr. Abram F. Myers, and Mr. Rush H. Williamson for the United States, and by Mr. C. Carroll Todd, Mr. Albert H. Veeder, Mr. Henry Veeder, Mr. R. C. McManus, Mr. Connor B. Shaw, and Mr. P. L. Holden, for Swift & Company; with leave to Mr. C. Carroll Todd to file additional brief within three days.

Pacific American Fisheries,
Petitioner,
246 vs.
Territory of Alaska.

This cause was argued by Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Rustgard for the respondent.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi,
Appellant,
242 vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alexander W. Smith, Jr., for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Seasongood, It is ordered that Frank J. Goebel, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Alonzo C. Wheeler, Esquire, and Oscar J. Lilly, Esquire, of Gainesville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, It is ordered that Dan Moody, Esquire, of Taylor, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Cleland Richardson Neal, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., Petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.
The United States of America, Petitioner,
810 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned to be heard with No. 425 to No. 445, assigned for Monday, November 30 next, without enlargement of time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi, Appellant,
242 vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alexander W. Smith, Jr., for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13 Original vs.
The State of Texas, defendant,
The United States, Intervener.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the defendant, The State of Texas, (on the counterclaim), continued by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the complainant, The State of Oklahoma, by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the intervener, the United States, and concluded by Mr. R. H. Ward for the defendant, the State of Texas.

Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
328 vs.
Indianapolis Union Railway Company etal.
Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
329 vs.
Indianapolis Union Railway Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the appellant, and by Mr. Joseph S. Graydon and Mr. J. J. Daniels for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

THE Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Symons, It is ordered that F. O. Richey, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that W. H. Whitaker, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Breckinridge Long, It is ordered that Benjamin H. Marbury, Esquire of Farmington, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Byrns, It is ordered that William W. Goodman, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James E. Watson, It is ordered that James M. Ogden, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anthony P. Nugent, It is ordered that J. Francis O'Sullivan, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri; Joseph H. Brady, Esquire, and Patrick W. Croker, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that S. J. Jones, Esquire, and William A. Franken, Esquire, of Carrollton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney W. Davidson, It is ordered that Arthur Mag, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that John J. Cunneen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
273 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Marianna Matthews,

Plaintiff in error,

39 vs.

Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer of Hamilton County, Ohio,

In error to the Court of Appeals for the First Judicial District of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals for the First Judicial District of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mortimer Matthews,

Plaintiff in error,

40 vs.

Louis J. Huwe, as Treasurer of Hamilton County, Ohio.

In error to the Court of Appeals for the First Judicial District of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals for the First Judicial District of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Missouri at the relation of and to the use of Wabash Railway Company et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

366 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartsville Oil Mill,
Appellant,
609 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Stevedoring Company,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
R. Haverty.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Collector,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument with No. 712, heretofore assigned for March 1st next, as one case.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
792 vs.
Nellie Kidd, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred L. Kriebel,
Petitioner,
796 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner,
797 vs.
The City of Tacoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
802 vs.
Worthington & Company, a Partnership, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi, Appellant,

242 vs.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Munich Reinsurance Company, Appellant,

631 vs.

First Reinsurance Company of Hartford.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the appearance of Hartwell Cabell, and to substitute John J. Cunneen, as counsel for the appellant,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Munich Reinsurance Company, Appellant,

631 vs.

First Reinsurance Company of Hartford.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Wells Gross and Mr. Lucius P. Robinson for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. John J. Cunneen in opposition thereto.

Clarence H. Myers,
361 vs.
Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

The motion to bring up the entire record herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Lamm for Clarence H. Myers.

H. P. Trusler, Plaintiff in error,
188 vs.
Noah Crooks et al.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William T. Chantland in behalf of Little, Powell, Smith and Goldstein, and the motion was denied.

Ex parte In the matter of
James A. Wood, Petitioner.
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Savage for the petitioner.

Luther Weedin, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,
791 vs.
Chin Bow.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Oscar R. Luhring for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. Warner Parker for the respondent.

The Farmers Loan & Trust Company, etc., Petitioner,
794 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Blanc for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondents.

The Farmers Loan & Trust Company, etc., Petitioner,
795 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Blanc for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondent.

Henry Pommery, Petitioner,
798 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David D. Stansbury and Mr. Thomas H. Mahony for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John A. Murphy, Petitioner,
799 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Myer Nussbaum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph Hanson, Plaintiff in error,
681 vs.
James W. Caldwell, Receiver et al.

In error to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of the State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leonard Metcalf et al., Co-partners, etc., Plaintiff in error, vs. John J. Mitchell, Former Collector.

183

John J. Mitchell, Former Collector, Plaintiff in error, vs. Leonard Metcalf et al., Co-partners etc.

376

On motion of Mr. Philip Nichols in that behalf, the death of John J. Mitchell having been suggested, It is ordered that Maria E. Mitchell, as administratrix of the estate of the said John J. Mitchell, deceased, be substituted as the party plaintiff in error in No. 376, and as the party defendant in error in No. 183.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

This cause was argued by Mr. Philip Nichols for Leonard Metcalf et al., copartners, etc., and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for Maria E. Mitchell, as administratrix etc.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant of the State of New York, Plaintiff in error, vs. United States Board of Tax Appeals.

320

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith pro se. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Claude C. Connally, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants, vs. General Construction Company.

314

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George F. Short for the appellants, and continued by Mr. J. D. Lydick for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that Alfred L. Tennyson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that A. L. Nash, Esquire, of Manitowoc, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Biddle, It is ordered that William B. Lymer, Esquire; Oliver P. Soares, Esquire, and Charles M. Hite, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Claude C. Connally, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oklahoma et al., Appellants,

314 vs.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. D. Lydick for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. J. Berry King for the appellants.

Dr. A. W. Boyd, Petitioner,
365 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sam E. Whitaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
James Daugherty.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. P. Nugent for the respondent.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.,
Appellants,
423 vs.
The Mechanics Securities Corporation.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
424 vs.
Securities Corporation General.
Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.,
Appellants,
425 vs.
Securities Corporation General.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
426 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.
Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.,
Appellants,
427 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
428 vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellants and petitioners.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian,
et al., Appellants,
429 vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
430 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian,
et al., Appellants,
431 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
432 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
433 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
434 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
435 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
436 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
437 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
438 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
439 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
440 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
441 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
442 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
443 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
444 vs.
August Hecksher.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
445 vs.
August Hecksher.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian,
et al., Petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

810 vs.

Mercantile Trust Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that Gordon Garland Lyell, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Winthrop Williams Aldrich, Esquire of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.,

Appellants,

423 vs.

The Mechanics Securities Corporation.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

424 vs.

Securities Corporation General.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
425 vs.
Securities Corporation General.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
426 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.
Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
427 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.
The United States of America,
Appellant ,
428 vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property
Custodian et al., Appellants,
429 vs.
C. I. Stralem et al.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
430 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of
New York.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property
Custodian et al., Appellants,
431 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of
New York.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
432 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellants and petitioners, and by Mr. M. Carter Hall for the appellees in Nos. 423 to 445, inclusive, by Mr. Samuel W. Fordyce for the respondent in Nos. 809 and 810, by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellees in Nos. 430 and 431, and concluded by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellants and petitioners.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
433 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
434 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
435 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
436 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
437 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
438 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
439 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
440 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
441 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
442 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
443 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
444 vs.
August Heckscher.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
445 vs.
August Heckscher.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian,
et al., Petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company,
Appellant,
417 vs.
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway
Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. T. D. Gresham for the appellant, and continued by Mr. J. W. Terry for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Moore, It is ordered that Robert E. Hogan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. H. L. Ekern in that behalf, It is ordered that the stipulation to open, file, and publish the report of the special Master and testimony herein, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,
76 vs.
Ernest J. Goneau.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. E. Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the respondent.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Appellant,
36 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Appellant,
36 vs.
The United States.

The United States,
Appellant,
398 vs.
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
399 vs.
Central New England Railway Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
400 vs.
The New England Steamship Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
499 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
500 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
401 vs.
The Reading Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the appellant in No. 36 and appellees in Nos. 401, 403, and 404; continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States in Nos. 36, 401, 402, 403, and 404; by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the appellant in No. 36, the appellees in Nos. 401, 403, and 404; submitted by Mr. L. T. Michener for the appellee in No. 401 and the appellant in No. 402; argument continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States in Nos. 398, 399, 400, 499, and 500; by Mr. B. D. Winner for the appellees in Nos. 398, 399, and 400; and concluded by Mr. J. F. McCarron for the appellee in Nos. 499 and 500.

The Reading Company,

Appellant,

402 vs.

The United States.

The United States,

Appellant,

403 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

The United States,

Appellant,

404 vs.

St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico

Railway Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Milburn, It is ordered that Fred B. Snyder, Esquire, and Edward C. Gale, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Piper, It is ordered that Frank H. Mason, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert Levy, It is ordered that Jesse Fine, Esquire, and H. Mortimer Kremer, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Anderson, It is ordered that Arden Howell, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that Archibald Broomfield, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan; Martin J. Cavanaugh, Esquire, of Ann Arbor, State of Michigan, and John Vincent Weadock, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that James H. Hart, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pacific American Fisheries,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Territory of Alaska.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

246

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Clarence H. Myers,
vs.
Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause.

361

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of
James A. Wood,
-- Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Sedgwick,
Plaintiff in error,
562 vs.
Thomas E. Wing, Trustee.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Munich Reinsurance Company,
Appellant,
631 vs.
First Reinsurance Company of Hartford.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luther Weedin, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,
791 vs.
Chin Bow.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company, etc., Petitioner,
794 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company, etc., Petitioner,
795 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Pommery,

Petitioner,

798 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Murphy,

Petitioner,

799 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 14th, until Monday, January 4th, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

93 vs.

Lucia E. Blount, etc., Administratrix etc.

This cause was continued on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant.

Thomas W.Miller, Alien Property Custodian, Appellant,
232 vs.
Richard Mayer et al.
Richard Mayer et al., Appellants,
233 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian et al.
Edwin Reis, et al., Appellants,
234 vs.
Richard Mayer et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell of counsel, having suggested the resignation of Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, It is ordered that Frederick C. Hicks, successor as Alien Property Custodian, be substituted as the party appellant in No. 232, and as a party appellee in Nos. 233 and 234.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty Warehouse Company, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
354 vs.
B. S. Crannis, as Commonwealth Attorney.

The motion to advance and transfer this cause to the Summary Docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Cole for the plaintiffs in error.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
767 vs.
Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company.

The motion to advance and transfer this cause to the Summary Docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher for the appellee.

Frank L. Smith et al., Appellants,
193 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

The motion to dismiss or to advance No. 670 to be heard with No. 193 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of Mr. William D. Bangs for the appellee in support of the motion.

Old Colony Trust Company, as Trustee, Appellant,
194 vs.
The City of Seattle, et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Miller in behalf of Mr. Howard A. Hanson and Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. James B. Howe for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant,
The United States Intervener.

On motion of Mr. Robert P. Cogswell in that behalf, the statement of the Commissioners as to expenses etc., was received and filed.

James V. Martin, Petitioner,
806 vs.
Honorable Frederick L. Siddons, Judge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph W. Cox and Mr. William H. White, Jr., for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
808 vs.
Mrs. Louis E. Gerow, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Douglass, Mr. Clyde A. Douglass, and Mr. Robert N. Simms for the respondent.

James B. Kelly, et al., Petitioners,
815 vs.
The City of Beggs, Oklahoma et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis W. Pratt and Mr. James M. Springer for the petitioners.

The State of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
880 vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, Mr. G. A. Youngquist, and Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Alexander E. Horn, and Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the respondent.

Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error,
756 vs.
F. L. Riley Mercantile Company et al.

In error to the Circuit Court of Jefferson County, State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner,
23 Original. (Case A).

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner,
24 Original. (Case B).

Ex parte In the matter of the State of Maryland, Petitioner,
25 Original. (Case C).

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. Herbert Levy for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson, for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
495 vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., et al.
Executors.

Three hours allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Lloyd M. Robbins and Mr. Peter F. Dunne for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Joseph G. Medlenka, Esquire, of Crowley, State of Louisiana, and Albert H. Van Hook, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Milburn, It is ordered that J. M. Richardson Lyeth, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Louis Joffe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur C. Froe, It is ordered that Harry J. Capehart, Esquire, of Welch, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
493 vs.
Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., et al., Executors etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Peter F.Dunne for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error.

Royal Mineral Association et al.,
Appellants,
388 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

William E. Boeing et al., etc.,
Appellants,
389 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

Robert E. Whiteside et al.,
Appellants,
390 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

Merrimac Mining Company,
Appellant,
391 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines et al., Appellants,
336 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

George L. Burrows, Jr., et al., etc.,
Appellants,
355 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

Helen P. Bardwell et al.,
Appellants,
471 vs.
Sargent Land Company et al.

Eight hours allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants in No. 355, and continued by Mr. William D. Bailey for the appellants in Nos. 388, 389, 390 and 391; by Mr. J. R. Van Derlip for the appellants in No. 471; by Mr. John G. Milburn for the appellants in No. 471; and by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Frank M. Bailey, Esquire, of Chickasha, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, It is ordered that Isidor A. Landesman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Mark Squires, Esquire, of Lenoir, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, It is ordered that Albert B. Boardman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that Joseph A. Brannon Dooley, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, It is ordered that Arthur G. Brode, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by this court that the renewal bond of the Clerk in the amount of twenty thousand dollars ($20,000), presented this day be, and the same is hereby, approved and ordered filed with the Attorney General, which said bond is in the words and figures following, viz:

"The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company,

Hartford, Connecticut.

Morgan B. Brainard,

President.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

That we, WILLIAM R. STANSBURY, as principal, and THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($20,000.) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States of America, or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 4th day of October, A. D. 1925.

Whereas, the above bounden WILLIAM R. STANSBURY hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

NOW, THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if he, the said WILLIAM R. STANSBURY, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States, then this obligation to be void, otherwise, to remain in full force and virtue in law.

Signed, sealed and delivered
in the presence of
(Signed) HORATIO STONIER. (Signed) WILLIAM R. STANSBURY.
(Signed) C. ELMORE CROPLEY. THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY.
(Signed) M. T. MATTIMORE. By (Signed) F. D. COMPTON,
(Signed) H. F. DEY. Attorney-in-fact.

Approved this 9th day of December, 1925, by order of the Court.

(Signed) WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice
of the United States. "

Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri (Merrill E. Otis et al., each as Members of the Public Service Commission and individually); Jesse W. Barrett, etc., et al., Appellants,
277 vs.
The Louisiana Water Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Mineral Association et al., Appellants,
388 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.
William B. Boeing et al., etc., Appellants,
389 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.

Robert E. Whiteside et al.,
Appellants,
390 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.
Merrimac Mining Company,
Appellant,
391 vs.
Samuel Lord, et al., etc.
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron
Mines et al., Appellants,
336 vs.
Samuel Lord et al., etc.
George L. Burrows, Jr., et al.,
etc., Appellants,
555 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.
Helen P. Bardwell et al.,
Appellants,
471 vs.
Sargent Land Company et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the appellees, and by Mr. G. A. Youngquist for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. M. L. Miller for the appellants in No. 336.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile,
No. 4776501, etc.
Port Gardner Investment Company,
611 vs.
The United States of America.

These cases were argued by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the respondent in cause No. 473, and Port Gardner Investment Company in cause No. 611, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

On motion of Mr. James A. Beha in behalf of Friedrich Schott, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

Six hours was allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that David Andrew Simmons, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, and James Carretson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that Benjamin Estes Carter, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Bruce, It is ordered that Milton Anthony Lehr, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hermen J. Galloway, It is ordered that Ewart W. Hobbs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the appellant, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Alvin E. Evans, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar. It is ordered that M. E. Lesser, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellant.

Leave was granted counsel for the appellant to file an additional brief herein within one week, and to counsel for the appellee to file a reply thereto within three days thereafter.

D. E. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection, etc.,

Appellant,

510 vs.

The Palmer Brothers Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. Lowry Humes for the appellant, and by Mr. Edwin W. Smith for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Lamb, It is ordered that Ernest S. Ballard, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Marie O. Andresen, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Frank G. Plain, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that E. E. McInnis, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Alonzo P. Deeds, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam Rayburn, It is Ordered that Roy M. Finley, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that George R. Stobbs, Esquire, and Charles B. Rugg, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
65 vs.
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Ex parte In the matter of
Marcus Gruber, Petitioner,
-- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied for want of original jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, as Alein Property Custodian, Appellants,
423 vs.
The Mechanics Securities Corporation.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
424 vs.
Securities Corporation General.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
425 vs.
Securities Corporation General.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
426 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee
in Bankruptcy.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian,
Appellants,
427 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
428 vs.
C. I. Stralem, Max Horwitz, et al.,
a Copartnership trading as Hallgarten & Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone Took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian; and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States,

Appellants,

429 vs.

C. I. Stralem, Max Horwitz, Albert Rothbarth, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

430 vs.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States,
Appellants,
vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

431

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

432

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

433

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
434 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States, and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
435 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
436 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
437 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America, Appellant,
438 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
439 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no party in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
440 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
441 vs.
Republic Trading Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
442 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
443 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took to part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
444 vs.
August Heckscher.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States; and Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellants,
445 vs.
August Heckscher.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian; and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States,
Petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; ~~with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr.Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Henderson Water Company,
Appellant,
249 vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina, William T. Lee, George P. Pell, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
The People of the State of California.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for rehearing in this cause, which was heretofore dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause is set down for further hearing on Monday, March 15th next, when the issue as to the jurisdiction of this Court and the merits of the case will be reargued.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty Warehouse Company, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
364 vs.
B. S. Grannis, as Commonwealth Attorney etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance or transfer this cause to the Summary Docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company et al., Appellants, vs. Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company.
767

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, and transfer to the Summary Docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 15th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank L. Smith et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company.
193 and 670

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in No. 193, be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

And it is further ordered that No. 670, be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument with No. 193.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Old Colony Trust Company, as Trustee etc., Appellant, vs. The City of Seattle et al.
194

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator.
683

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Fred A. Elder.
684

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the cause on the merits.

And it is further ordered that these cases be advanced to be heard as one case on the regular docket on Monday, March 15th next, after the cases

The State of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
820 vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James V. Martin,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
Hon. Frederick L. Siddons,
Judge etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
Mrs. Louise E. Gerow, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James B. Kelly et al.,
Petitioners,
815 vs.
The City of Beggs, Oklahoma, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, et al.,
Appellants,
418 vs.
Joe Dukich.
Israel Seligman,
Appellant,
674 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector et al.

The motion to advance and consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf.

Marion & Rye Valley Railway Company, Appellant,
515 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Victor A. Remy in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
623 vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mahlon B. Doing in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. Addison D. Gibbs, and Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., for the petitioners.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Plaintiff in error,
612 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
Joseph B. Marsino,
Plaintiff in error,
613 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion to advance this cause for argument immediately following cause No. 145, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Rugg for the defendant in error in Nos. 612 and 613.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States,et al., Appellants,

423 vs.

The Mechanics Securities Corporation.

The United States of America, Appellant,

424 vs.

Securities Corporation General.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,

425 vs.

Securities Corporation General.

The United States of America, Appellant,

426 vs.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.

Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al., Appellants,

427 vs.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee.

The United States of America, Appellant,

428 vs.

C. I. Stralem, et al., etc.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian et al., Appellants,

429 vs.

C. I. Stralem, et al.

The United States of America, Appellant,

430 vs.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf,

It is now here ordered that the mandates in these cases shall issue forthwith.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property
Custodian, et al.,
Appellants,
431 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
432 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
433 vs.
American National Bank of St. Paul.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
434 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
435 vs.
Henry G. Hilken.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
436 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
437 vs.
Abraham L. Garbat.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
438 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
439 vs.
Anna Thalmann.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
440 vs.
Republic Trading Company.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
441 vs.
Republic Trading Company.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
442 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
443 vs.
Jacob Kaufman.
The United States of America,
Appellant,
444 vs.
August Heckscher.
Frank White, Treasurer of the United States,
et al., Appellants,
445 vs.
August Heckscher.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian,
et al., Petitioners,
809 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
Mercantile Trust Company.

Chin Set Wong, Uncle and Next Friend of Chin Fook, Appellant,
647 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.
Seid Man, as Next Friend of Seid Wong, Appellant,
648 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

The motion to extend the time fixed by section 9 of rule 11 for filing statement of points to be relied upon and designation by appellant of parts of the record to be printed, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell in behalf of counsel for the appellants, and it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Moritz Neuberger,
824 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. R. Brylawski in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall for Moritz Neuberger.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
813 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of the State of Idaho.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety, Mr. Thomas Balmer, Mr. L. B. da Ponte, Mr. F. M. Dudley, Mr. Alex. M. Winston, and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. E. Elmquist for the respondent.

D. H. Brasfield et al., Petitioners,
814 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of Mr. John W. Preston for the petitioners, and by the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Ralph Nakutin, alias Ralph Natkin, Petitioner,
818 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Levy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
819 vs.
Edward Ott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. N. Van Doren, Mr. Nelson J. Wilcox, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 4 next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 4th, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Willis Van Devanter.

James C. McReynolds.

Louis D. Brandeis.

George Sutherland. Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler.

Edward T. Sanford.

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Lester B. Griffith, Esquire, of Phillipsburg, State of New Jersey, and John O. Timlin, Esquire, of Sayre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. I. Salinger, it is ordered that Norman B. Bartlett, Esquire, and Elbert O. Jones, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Permenter, it is ordered that Nat M. Lacy, Esquire, of Macon, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Lees, it is ordered that Stanley B. Hall, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. M. Campbell, it is ordered that Harold E. Judge, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Egan, it is ordered that Frank E. Healy, Esquire, of Windsor Locks, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Smith W. Bennett, it is ordered that Joseph A. Godown, Esquire, and John R. King, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, it is ordered that Cyrus Edgar Dietz, Esquire, of Moline, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander M. Bull, it is ordered that Edwin C. Blanchard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

George D. Provost and Cornelius W. Provost, Copartners, Composing the Firm of Provost Bros. & Company,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

258

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
P. Chauncey Anderson, Lowell L.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

337

Richards, C. A. Richards,
et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States,
Appellant,
420 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The Yale & Towne Manufacturing
Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault
Ste. Marie Railway Company,
Petitioner,
76 vs. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.
Ernest J. Geneau.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
3 vs.
River Rouge Improvement Company, J. Calvert Sons, Inc., Dodge Brothers, et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Perry Browning, William Coleman, James E. Dale, et al.,
Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper, E. A. McDonald, E. L. Bishop, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;

and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

American Steel Foundries,
156 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, and Simplex Electric Heating Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that question No. 1 must be answered in the negative, and, since this will dispose of the case, categorical answers to the other questions certified are not deemed necessary.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

William O'Hara and Sven Tjersland,
Petitioners,
224 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Claude C. Connally, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oklahoma; Howard S. Wilson, County Attorney of Kay County, Oklahoma, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
General Construction Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

314

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result on the ground that the plaintiff was not violating the statute by any criterion available in the vicinity of Cleveland.

Live Oak Water Users' Association, Butte County Farm Bureau, Sutter County Farm Bureau, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California and Sutter-Butte Canal Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

73

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
vs.
James Daugherty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

303

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

13 Original vs.

The State of Texas, defendant,

The United States, Intervener.

On consideration of the third report of the commissioners heretofore selected to run, locate, and mark portions of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the south bank of the Red River, showing that they have run, located, and marked particular sections of such boundary from the one hundredth meridian of longitude to the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, other than the Big Bend and Fort Augur areas covered by two reports heretofore presented and confirmed, which said third report was presented and filed herein November 16, 1925;

And no objection or exception to such report being presented, although the time therefor has expired;

It is now here adjudged, ordered, and decreed that the said report be in all respects confirmed.

It is further adjudged, ordered, and decreed that the boundary line delineated and set forth in the report and on the map accompanying the same and referred to therein be established and declared to be the true boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River at the several places designated in such report, subject, however, to such changes as may hereafter be wrought by the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion as specified in the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of the decree rendered herein March 12, 1923, 261 U. S. 340.

It is further ordered that the clerk of this court do transmit to the Chief Magistrate of the States of Texas and Oklahoma copies of this decree duly authenticated under the seal of this Court, together with copies of said report and the maps accompanying the same.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

13 Original vs.

The State of Texas, defendant,

The United States Intervener.

The report of the Boundary commissioners of the work done, time employed, and expenses incurred in the survey marking and mapping of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River from the one hundredth meridian of longitude to the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, other than the Big Bend and Fort Argur areas, pursuant to the decree of March 12, 1923 (261 U. S. 340), is approved and adopted. The compensation of the commissioners for the work done by them, as shown in the report, is fixed at $3,350 for Arthur D. Kidder, and at $5,800 for Arthur A. Stiles. The expenses incurred, as shown in the report, and the compensation here allowed shall be charged as part of the costs in this cause and shall be borne and paid by the three parties to the cause in the proportions specified in the said decree. The parties severally shall be credited with the amounts advanced by them, as shown in the report; and they shall advance additional amounts to pay the compensation of the commissioners, as here allowed, and the balance of $146.68 due to Arthur D. Kidder for expenses paid by him as shown in the report.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of New Jersey,

Complainant,

20 Original vs.

John G. Sargent et al.

IN EQUITY.

This cause came on to be heard upon the bill of complaint and a motion to dismiss the same, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa,

Plaintiff in error,

26 vs.

L. B. Anderson, County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, and G. P. Taylor, County Treasurer of Guthrie County, Iowa.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

493 vs.

Reuel D. Robbins, Jr., and Sadie M. Robbins, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of R. D. Robbins, etc.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, et al., Appellants,
418 vs.
Joe Dukich.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate and advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Israel Seligman, Appellant,
674 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector et al.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc., Petitioners,
625 vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Marsino, Plaintiff in error,
612 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Joseph B. Marsino, Plaintiff in error,
613 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Moritz Neuberger,
824 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

813 vs.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Idaho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. H. Brasfield et al.,

Petitioners,

814 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Russo, alias Massimino Pissanello,

Petitioner,

793 vs.

The People of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph Nakutin, alias Ralph Natkin,
Petitioner,
818 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Edward Ott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Lawrence,
Petitioner,
868 vs.
The State of Arizona.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered by this Court that the motion by petitioner to be allowed to proceed in this Court in forma pauperis and for a stay of sentence be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Ida Hughes,
Plaintiff in error,
739 vs.
The State of Georgia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
512 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. A. W. Laferty in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Marion-Rye Valley Railway Co.,
Appellant,
315 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Milton C. Elliott in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief for the Colorado and Cripple Creek Railroad Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

Lazarus G.Joseph et al.,
Petitioners,
449 vs.
John Bordman et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Green for the petitioners.

International Stevedoring Co.,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
R. Haverty.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Hartman in that behalf.

Edward P. Coltra,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War et al.

The resignation of John W. Weeks, as Secretary of War, having been suggested, it is ordered that Dwight F. Davis, present Secretary of War, be substituted as the party respondent in this cause, on motion of Mr. Joseph T. Davis in that behalf.

Marion L. Frost et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Blanchard in that behalf.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
787 vs.
Williams Slate Company.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arden Howell in behalf of Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Stanley F. Ashe, Warden etc.,
Appellant,
521 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Valotta.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James O. Campbell for the appellant.

Beatrice J. Weston et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
227 vs.
The City of Tulsa et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Clay, Mr. Milton S. Dillon, R. C. Allen and Mr. I. J. Underwood, for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Louis W. Pratt and Mr. James M. Springer for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Dwight Harrison,
Plaintiff in error,
610 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. R. Pugh, Mr. John R. Knight and Mr. J. A. Godown for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. Robert R. Nevin for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

United States Sugar Equalization Board, Inc., Petitioner, 800 vs. P. DeRonde & Company, Inc.	The Motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Francis for the respondent.
J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of the Texas and Pacific Railway, Plaintiff in error, 174 vs. H. L. Smith et al. defendants in error.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. D. Gresham and Mr. Robert L. W. Thompson for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Thornton Hardie for the
The Alexander Milburn Company. Petitioner, 107 vs. Davis-Bournonville Company.	On motion of Mr. Thomas Ewing in that behalf leave was hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae in this cause.
H. B. Crone, Appellant, 504 vs. John W. Snook, Warden etc.	The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing for the appellant.
The State of Louisiana, Complainant, 22 Orig. vs. The State of Mississippi.	The motion and a stipulation of counsel for the appointment of a commissioner to take testimony and proofs in this cause was submitted

to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash, of counsel for the complainant.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company et al., Appellants, 312 vs. The United States of America et al.	The motion for an order as to the taxation of costs in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Harry C. Howard for the appellants.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and
Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz, in that behalf, leave was granted to file demurrer and motion to dismiss the amended bill of complaint in this cause; to fix the time for filing the briefs of counsel herein, and to submit motion to assign the cause for argument on Monday, March 8th next. On motion of Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, of counsel for defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago, leave was granted to file answer of said defendant to the amended bill of complaint.

Allan Pinkerton, doing business as Pinkerton's National Detective Agency et al., Appellants,
823 vs.
Eugene Wengert et al.

On motion of Mr. Dean Acheson, in behalf of counsel, leave was granted to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record in this cause to be printed.

Clarence C. Culver,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
Margaret Sutton, by Harwood Hall, her guardian ad litem.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Grosscup, Mr. W. Carr Morrow and Mr. Charles A. Wallace for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. K. Poe for the respondent.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Ella Cacketts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Grosscup, Mr. W. Carr Morrow, and Mr. Charles A. Wallace for the petitioner.

Wade Larramore et al., Petitioners,
826 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit submitted by Mr. John W. Bennett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

J. C. Owens, Petitioner,
829 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit submitted by Mr. Joseph E. Morrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Evelyn Brown, Petitioner,
830 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit submitted by Mr. Joseph E. Morrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Edward F. Cullom et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
832 vs.
E. B. Kearns.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit submitted by Mr. J. E. Alexander for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis M. Swink for the respondent.

M. F. Jones, Petitioner,
833 vs.
Irving Page, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit submitted by Mr. John B. Dudley for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. D. Shear and Mr. E. E. Blake for the respondent.

Beech-Nut Packing Company, Petitioner,
834 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit submitted by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Walter A. Scott, Mr. James R. Offield, and Mr. H. McClure Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. William R. Perkins for the

W. S. Whiting, petitioner,
835 vs.
Mark Squires, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred S. Barnard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Squires for the respondent.

George B. Wilson, petitioner,
837 vs.
Elk Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore, Mr. F. C. Reagan, and Mr. Abner H. Ferguson for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Donworth, Mr. Elmer B. Todd, Mr. John C. Higgins, and Mr. Charles F. Donworth for the respondent.

Cologero Fasulo, petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin L. McKinley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Oscar C. Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Kurt Kling et al., petitioners,
841 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ferdinand Henry Wurzer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The United States ex rel. Skinner and Eddy Corporation, petitioner,
847 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted by Mr. Louis Titus and Mr. J. Barrett Carter for the petitioner; with leave, granted on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, to file brief for the respondent within ten days.

John W. Langley, petitioner,
848 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The State of Arkansas,
Complainant,
2 Original vs.
The State of Tennessee.

The proposed form of decree, pursuant to the opinion of this Court, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Caruthers Ewing for the complainant, and by Mr. Guston T. Fitzhugh for the defendant.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
182 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, plaintiff in error,
350 vs.
The Lakewood Engineering Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs to be paid by the defendant in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the matter of the disbarment of: John H. Adriaans, Walter Holland, Horace L. B. Atkisson, Henry E. Bolt, and Norman T. Whitaker.

The Clerk reported the filing of returns to the rules to show cause heretofore issued herein by John H. Adriaans, Walter Holland, Horace L. B. Atkisson, Henry E. Bolt and Norman T. Whitaker.

Ex parte: In the matter of the disbarment of: L. Grandin Grossman.

The Clerk reported that no return to the rule to show cause heretofore issued herein has been filed by L. Grandin Grossman.

George H. Kelly et al., Copartners, etc., appellants,
85 vs.
Dwight W. Davis, Secretary et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees, it was ordered that this cause be continued.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers, Plaintiffs in error,
101 vs.
Bernice S. Graham.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Prendergast, Mr. T. D. Gresham, Mr. George Thompson, and Mr. Robert L. W. Thompson for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. C. George for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the complainant, and continued by Mr. M. J. Brown for the defendant.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Don F. Reed, It is ordered that William M. Donlin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, Jr., It is ordered that Bernard J. Vincent, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Cobb, It is ordered that Samuel M. Dudley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Arthur B. Spingarn, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Mortimer M. Harris, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles O. Bailey, It is ordered that Ed. L. Grantham, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the First Collection District of New York, Petitioner,
295 vs.
Emma B. Johnson, Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits which were of John G. Johnson, Deceased.

On motion of Mr. John M. Perry, Mr. C. Alexander Capron, Mr. Russell L. Bradford, and Mr. Walter F. Taylor, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

The United States of America, Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. J. Brown for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. G. A. Youngquist for the defendant.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. Meredith P. Sawyer in behalf of the complainant, leave was granted to file an additional brief herein within one week; with leave to Mr. R. M. Rieser to file an additional brief for the defendant within one week thereafter.

This cause was argued by Mr. Meredith P. Sawyer for the complainant, and by Mr. R. M. Rieser for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank M. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles O. Bailey, It is ordered that Logan Berry, Esquire, of Clark, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. William Ramseyer, It is ordered that Lloyd L. Duke, Esquire, of Ottumwa, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. McLachlen, It is ordered that Malvern E. Schultz, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Edward J. Farrell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that Paul E. Haworth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that James McHenry, Esquire, of Deadwood, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector etc., Petitioner,
295 vs.
Emma B. Johnson, as Administratrix.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Newton K. Fox for the petitioner, continued by Mr. W. H. Trigg for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. V. Lowell for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. John M. Perry for the respondent.

Marion & Rye Valley Railway Company, Appellant,
315 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ben B. Cain for the appellant, continued by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Milton C. Elliott for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, It is ordered that William Warfield Ross, Esquire, and Howard Cecil Kilpatrick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. de Bruler, It is ordered that Otto Russell Stites, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that Richard H. Radley, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that Y. D. Mathes, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Willis B. Goodenow, Esquire, and Harry J. Lippman, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Michael McTernan, Plaintiff in error,
776 vs.
The City of Kansas City, Missouri.

On motion of Mr. James A. Reed for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file statement of points to be relied upon.

Postum Cereal Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
121 vs.
California Fig Nut Company.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,
88 vs.
J. M. Luna et al., etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Markell for the appellant, and by Mr. M. J. Helmick for the appellees.

L. Littlejohn & Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
94 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. W. Ryan for the appellants, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the appellants.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
95 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
96 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
97 vs.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
98 vs.
Northern States Power Company.

A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioner, etc.,
Appellants,
99 vs.
The City of Sioux Falls.

A.G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
100 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

Three hours allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the appellants, and continued by Mr. H. B. Bartlett for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court [illegible]

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1925.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Martin A. Hogan, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey D. Snow, It is ordered that Edward L. Smead, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Joseph Bryan Morris, Esquire, and M. C. Adams, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ed. L. Grantham, It is ordered that Frank McNulty, Esquire, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis C. Sears, It is ordered that Raymond C. Young, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William H. Edwards, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
129 vs.
Archibald Douglas et al., Executors, etc.

On motion of Mr. Paul Armitage in that behalf, leave was granted to file a petition for rehearing herein.

A. G. Risty, et al., County Commissioners, etc., Appellants,
95 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.
A. G. Risty, et al., County Commissioners, etc., Appellants,
96 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.
A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc., Appellants,
97 vs.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.
A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc., Appellants,
98 vs.
Northern States Power Company.
A. G. Risty et al., County Commissioners, etc., Appellants,

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. C.O. Bailey for the appellees in Nos. 96, 97 and 99; and submitted by Mr. E. S. Stringer for the appellee in No. 95, by Mr. R. M. Campbell for the appellee in No. 98, by Mr. E. L. Grantham for the appellee in No. 96, and by Mr. Harold E. Judge for the appellees in Nos. 98 and 100. The argument was continued by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. E. C. Jones for the appellant.

A. G. Misty et al., County Commissioners, etc.,
Appellants,
100 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

Irene Hand Corrigan et al.,
Appellants,
104 vs.
John J. Buckley.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellants, continued by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Moorfield Storey for the appellants.

Midland Land & Improvement Company,
Appellant,
105 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle C. Michener, It is ordered that Joseph L. Hooper, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Summers, It is ordered that Frank L. Dempsey, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Will E. Reardon, Esquire, of Santa Monica, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Larner, It is ordered that William Hamlin Neely, Esquire, and Paul A. Kunkel, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds, It is ordered that Arba B. Marvin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Joseph P. Shoup, Esquire, and Thomas P. Cleary, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Leonard Metcalf and Harrison P. Eddy, Copartners under the Name and Style of Metcalf & Eddy, Plaintiffs in error,
183 vs.
Maria E. Mitchell, Administratrix of the Estate of John J. Mitchell, Deceased, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Massachusetts.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Maria E. Mitchell, Administratrix of the Estate of John J. Mitchell, Deceased, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Massachusetts, Plaintiff in error,
376 vs.
Leonard Metcalf and Harrison P. Eddy, Copartners under the Name and Style of Metcalf & Eddy.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Frank C. Bramwell, Superintendent of Banks of the State of Oregon, Appellant,
192 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
503 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Lee A. Price, as Receiver in Equity of J. M. Gidding & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
454 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank E. Stripe and Maurice P. Davidson, as Receivers in Equity of Johnson Shipyards Corporation, Petitioner,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

H. P. Trusler, Plaintiff in error,
188 vs.
Noah Crooks and Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Sixth District of Missouri.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Lazarus G. Joseph et al., Petitioners,
449 vs.
John Bordman et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 19th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marion L. Frost et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
828 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument

Stanley P. Ashe, Warden etc., Appellant,
521 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Valotta.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Stevedoring Company, Petitioner,
789 vs.
R. Haverty.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Sugar Equalization Board, Inc., Petitioner,
800 vs.
P. DeRonde & Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. B. Crone, Appellant,
504 vs.
John W. Snook, Warden.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. B. Crone, Appellant,
504 vs.
John W. Snook, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and on motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that, having examined the petition for a writ of habeas corpus, for which this is an appeal, and found the question therein contained frivolous, the appeal herein, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Louisiana,

Complainant,

22 Original. vs.

The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion of Robert Ash, Esquire, of counsel for the complainant, and of the stipulation of counsel for the respective parties designating Jack Thompson, Esquire, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Jackson, Mississippi, as the Commissioner to take testimony and proofs and to certify the same to this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion and stipulation be, and the same are hereby, approved; and that the said Jack Thompson, Esquire, be, and he is hereby, appointed a Commissioner of this Court to take testimony and proofs offered by the parties in accordance with the terms of the motion and stipulation filed herein on December 22, 1925.

It is further ordered that the said Commissioner, before assuming his duties, shall take and subscribe an oath that he will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties devolving upon him as such Commissioner according to the best of his abilities and understanding. Such oath to be filed with the Clerk of this Court.

It is further ordered that the said Commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate of Ten dollars ($10.00) per diem while engaged in executing this commission.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company et al., Appellants,
312 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion of the appellants for an order fixing the Clerk's fee for supervising the printing of the record in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that, in view of the exceptional circumstances of this particular case, the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, to the extent that the narrative form of the record, and certain designated papers from the certified transcript of record, filed pursuant to the order of this Court, shall be considered the record as filed for the purpose of taxation of the Clerk's fee for supervising the printing, and the Clerk shall receive a fee of ten cents per folio thereon.

And it is further ordered by this Court that in addition to the fee for supervising as above ordered, the clerk shall tax and receive the sum of twenty-five dollars as compensation for the additional labor imposed upon him in the preparation of this record for the printer.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois et al.

On consideration of the motion to set this cause for argument, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 8 next.

Beatrice J. Weston, E. V. Raper, Edna B. Loomis, A. W. Severs, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
227 vs.
City of Tulsa, Tibbets & Pleasant, Inc., and Southern Surety Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Dwight Harrison,
Plaintiff in error,
610 vs.
The State of Ohio.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the merits.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed upon the Summary Docket and assigned for argument on Monday, March 8 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
787 vs.
Williams Slate Company.

In error to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

It is further ordered that, there appearing to be no reasonable ground for granting a petition for certiorari, a penalty of Twenty-five dollars be, and is hereby, awarded respondent and against the petitioner as reasonable damages for the delay, under the proviso in Section C of Section 237 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of February 13, 1925, c. 229, sec. 1, 43 Stat. 937.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
787 vs.
Williams Slate Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster and Charles L. Wallace, Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway, Plaintiffs in error, vs. H. L. Smith and Henrietta Florence Smith. 174

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway, Plaintiffs in error, vs. H. L. Smith et al. 174

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster and Charles L. Wallace, Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway. Plaintiffs in error, vs. Bernice S. Graham. 101

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is here by, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence C. Culver,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beech-nut Packing Company,
Petitioner,
834 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cologero Fasulo,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
Margaret Sutton, by Harwood Hall,
Her Guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Ella Cackette.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wade Larramore et al.,
Petitioners,
826 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Owens,
Petitioner,
829 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Evelyn Brown,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward F. Cullom et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
852 vs.
E. B. Kearns.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. F. Jones,
Petitioner,
853 vs.
Irving Page, Receiver etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. S. Whiting,
Petitioner,
855 vs.
Mark Squires, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George B. Wilson, Petitioner,
837 vs.
Elk Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kurt Kling et al., Petitioner,
841 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Langley, Petitioner,
848 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
157 vs.
The Trenton Potteries Company, et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, this cause was continued.

William H. Edwards, Collector,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
Chile Copper Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

The United States,
Appellant,
470 vs.
John J. Mitchell et al.

The Motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
846 vs.
George L. Wimberley, Jr., Administrator.

On motion of Mr. Milton J. Elliott in behalf of counsel, leave was granted within which to serve the printed record, and thirty days was granted the respondent within which to file brief.

Concrete Appliances Company et al.,
Petitioners,
44 vs.
John E. Gomery et al.

The motion for an order taxing ~~the~~ bond premium as costs was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Galloway in that behalf.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
131 vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. The Public Utilities Commission for the State of Kansas et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same

Arthur Vanderbilt et al., Receivers, Plaintiffs in error,
387 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
836 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Portneuf Marsh Valley Canal Company, Petitioner,
839 vs.
Howard W. Brown et al., Trustees.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Peterson, Mr. T. C. Coffin, and Mr. D. C. McDougall for the petitioner.

Otto L. Morris, Petitioner,
842 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Anna Huben, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifton P. Williamson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Humphrey J. Lynch for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
850 vs.
Annie Belts, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifton P. Williamson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Humphrey J. Lynch for the respondent.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
854 vs.
Augustus H. Bewsher.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. R. H. Van Doren for the petitioner.

Midland Land & Improvement Company, Appellant,
105 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Clarence C. Calhoun for the appellant, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Clarence C. Calhoun for the appellant.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Executor, Plaintiff in error,
106 vs.
Rufus A. Doughton, Commissioner of Revenue.

This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Robinson for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. D. G. Brummitt for the defendant in error.

The Alexander Milburn Company, Petitioner,
107 vs.
Davis-Bournonville Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James A. Watson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Paul A. Chase, Esquire, of Brattleboro, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that Lloyd T. Crane, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, and Robert S. Marx, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean H. Stanley, It is ordered that Herbert R. Limburg, Esquire, and Mortimer H. Hess, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Rea Williams, It is ordered that Paul H. Schmidt, Esquire, and James T. Cutler, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Alexander Milburn Company,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Davis-Bournonville Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James A. Watson for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. S. Edmonds for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James A. Watson for the petitioner.

The Interocean Oil Company,
Appellant,
115 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Kern for the appellant; and the cause submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Randolph S. Collins for the appellee.

Georgine Iselin,
Appellant,
119 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. G. Pickering for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

H. E. Crook Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
122 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. G. M. Brady for the appellant, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the appellant.

Chamberlain Machine Works,
Appellant,
123 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that B. Harris Henderson, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Charles K. Bullard, Esquire, and George Sublett Atkinson, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Gorman, It is ordered that James Joseph Danaher, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
130 vs.
Isidore Cohn.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Bernhardt Frank and Mr. Benjamin P. Epstein for the defendant in error.

E. Glavin and Laura M. Glavin,
Appellants,
133 vs.
Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chamberlain Machine Works,
Appellant,
123 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellee.

Millers Indemnity Underwriters,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
Mrs. Nellie Boudreaux Braud, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. B. Morris for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. M. G. Adams for the defendant in error.

Northern Cedar Company,
Plaintiff in error,
729 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington et al.
Yakima County Horticultural Union,
Plaintiff in error,
730 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington et al.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. V. Halverstadt for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. H. Dunbar for the defendants in error.

C. W. Chamberlain & Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
731 vs.
Frank H. Lloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington, et al.

Panama Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
260 vs.
Agapito Vasquez, Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the respondent.

The Evansville & Bowling Green Packet Company, Appellant,
127 vs.
Chero Cola Bottling Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the appellant, continued by Mr. James T. Cutler and Mr. Paul H. Schmidt for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the appellants.

Charles Marx, Executor,
Plaintiff in error,
128 vs.
Elizabeth Reinecke.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. B. Harris Henderson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Charles B. Selby, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Julius Freiberg, It is ordered that Thomas L. Pogue, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Doras Hebert et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
145 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

E. C. F. Sanchez et al.,
Appellants,
134 vs.
Charles Deering et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. F. M. Hudson in that behalf, the death of James Deering having been suggested, It is ordered that Charles Deering and Richard F. Howe, in their own right, and Richard F. Howe as Executor of the said James Deering, deceased, be substituted as appellees

E. C. F. Sanchez, et al., Appellants, vs. Charles Deering et al., etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. William W. Dewhurst for the appellants, and by Mr. F. M. Hudson for the appellees.
134	
Armour & Company, Petitioner, vs. Fort Morgan Steamship Company, et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioner, and by Mr. Victor Leovy for the respondents.
135	
Girard Trust Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.
137	

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that John F. Gillespie, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence Koenigsberger, It is ordered that Harry C. Grossman, Esquire, and David H. Greenberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Arne C. Wiprud, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour, It is ordered that Fernand deJournel, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest S. Ballard, It is ordered that James Dale Thom, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, It is ordered that Clint C. Hine, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Consolidation Coal Company,
Appellant,
456 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delia Salzer,
Plaintiff in error,
148 vs.
The United States of America et al.

This cause was continued on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the defendants in error.

Isabelle Barnette,
Appellant,
149 vs.
Wells Fargo Nevada National Bank of San Francisco et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. P. Henshall and Mr. William H. Chapman for the appellant, and by Mr. F. de Journel and Mr. Sidney M. Ehrman for the appellees.

Girard Trust Company et al.,
Appellants,
137 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. J. C. Peacock for the

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
138 vs.
Galbreath Cattle Company et al.,
etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Parker Veazey, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the respondents.

Sidney Mandelbaum,
Appellant,
139 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. L. Bump for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the appellee.

George William Mottram,
Appellant,
142 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Wisconsin Lime & Cement Company,
Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
141 vs.
The City of Chicago.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. L. C. Caldwell for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Glenn W. Ruebush, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, It is ordered that Frankland Briggs, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Edwin Phillips Kohl, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Larsen, It is ordered that I. W. Rountree, Esquire, of Swainsboro, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Carter, It is ordered that Hugh Thomas Carter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Wiener, It is ordered that Annie W. Hochfelder, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. B. Blakeney, It is ordered that Kathryn Van Leuven, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Edward B. Downie, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that Charles W. Paltzer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey E. Richardson, It is ordered that H. H. Phelps, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Gregorio T. Abella, Esquire, of Pagsanjan, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,

Appellant,

91 vs.

St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,

Appellant,

92 vs.

Wabash Railway Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second New York District, Petitioner,

375 vs.

Chile Copper Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 8 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,

470 vs.

John J. Mitchell, et al., as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Dellora R. Gates, Deceased.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for

Concrete Appliances Company and William H. Insley,

Petitioners,

44 vs.

John E. Gomery, John C. Schwartz, Michael J. O'Meara, et al.

On consideration of the motion for a ruling on the taxation of bond premiums as costs herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Vanderbilt and George Wilson, Receivers of the Southern Cotton Oil Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

387 vs.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Cedar Company,

Plaintiff in error,

729 vs.

Frank H. Lloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington and Fred H. Dibble, as Director of Licenses of the State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of The State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yakima County Horticultural Union,
Plaintiff in error,
730 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington and Fred H. Dibble, as Director of Licenses of the State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Chamberlain & Company, E. C. Klyce & Company, Walter Bowen & Company et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
731 vs.
Frank H. Gloyd, as Director of Agriculture of the State of Washington and Fred H. Dibble, as Director of Licenses of the State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
847 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
836 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Portneuf Marsh Valley Canal Company, Petitioner,
839 vs.
Howard W. Brown and John R. Chapin, as Trustees.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otto L. Morris, Petitioner,
842 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Anna Huben, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Michael Huben, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Annie Beltz, as Administratrix of the goods, chattels and credits of Milton D. Beltz, Deceased.

850 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Augustus H. Bewsher.

854 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order of the Court:

In re disbarment of Norman T. Whitaker, John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, Henry B. Bolt, and Walter Holland.

Informations having been presented to this court against Norman T. Whitaker, John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, Henry B. Bolt, and Walter Holland, by John S. Flannery, a member of the Bar of this court and chairman of the grievance committee of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, setting forth charges against such persons—that they are unfit persons to continue as members of the bar of this court—and suggesting their disbarment, and the court having, in accordance with the suggestion of petitioner, issued rules against such persons to show cause why they should not be disbarred, and such persons informed against, except L. Grandin Grossman, having answered the rules to show cause,

It is now here ordered that the informations and the rules to show cause and the returns thereon, and the information against Grossman, upon which no return is made, as well as the exhibits attached to the papers, shall be referred to the Solicitor General, Mr. Stanton C. Peele and Mr. William G. Brantley, as a committee of the bar of this court, to consider the charges, the answers thereto by the returns, and the exhibits attached thereto, to make such inquiry into the matter as may be necessary or appropriate, and thereupon to make a report and recommendation respecting the final action to be taken herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Appellant,
864 vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company et al.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company et al., Appellants,
865 vs.
The United States.

The motion to consolidate and to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The motion for leave to file a stipulation to amend the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor

H. E. Crook Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
122 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Bynum E. Hinton in behalf of the appellant, leave was granted to file additional authorities.

The Liberty Warehouse Company,
Plaintiff in error,
584 vs.
Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Marketing Association.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan D. Cole for the plaintiff in error.

Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
767 vs.
Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company.

The motion of the appellant to remand this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa without decision, and with leave to file a bill of review, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Evans for the appellant.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
135 vs.
Fort Morgan Steamship Company, Limited et al.

The motion for leave to file an additional brief for the petitioner was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and the motion was denied.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
339, 340, and 341.
vs.
Harry Ritcey, Master of the British Schooner "Marjorie E. Bachman," etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Cobb in behalf by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the appellee.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company,
Petitioner,
604 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Phelps, Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. G. A. Youngquist for the respondent.

Mrs. Ida Hughes,
Plaintiff in error,
739 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
574 vs.
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther M. Walter, Mr. James D. Condon, and Mr. William E. Lamb for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Homer T. Dick and Mr. M. F. Gallagher for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Alexander C. Shaw, Attorney in fact for N. R. Waterman,
Petitioner,
852 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. B. M. Parmenter, and Mr. H. L. Underwood for the respondent.

Arizona Commercial Mining Company,
Petitioner,
853 vs.
Iron Cap Copper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Gila County, State of Arizona, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Gray and Mr. Burton E. Eames for the respondent.

Mildred D. Holt, Edgar Daniel,
Dollie Daniel Walker,
et al., etc., Petitioners,
855 vs.
Daniel Sons & Palmer Company and
Daniel Sons & Palmer Company et al.,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Archibald B. Lovett for the respondent.

Charles E. Schaff, as Receiver
of the Properties of the Missouri,
Kansas & Texas Railway Company,
Petitioner,
856 vs.
Ella Daugherty, Administratrix and
Personal Representative of the
Estate of Emery Garfield Daugherty,
deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Charles S. Burg, and Mr. Maurice D. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the respondent.

The Straesser-Arnold Company,
Petitioner,
857 vs.
The Franklin Sugar Refining
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude U. Stone for the petitioner.

John Mazukiewicz,
Petitioner,
858 vs.
The Hanover National Bank of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Frueauff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Percy S. Dudley for the respondent.

American Refrigerator Transit Company et al., Petitioners,
859 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. de Gersdorff, Mr. T. H. Devine, Mr. M. U. Hayden, and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioners, and by Mr. Winslow S. Pierce and Mr. Homer Hall for the respondent.

The motion for leave to file intervening petitions was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. North T. Gentry for the State of Missouri; by Mr. North T. Gentry in behalf of Mr. Dan Moody for the State of Texas; and by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the State of New Jersey.

Wisconsin Lime & Cement Company, Inc., Plaintiff in error,
141 vs.
City of Chicago.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Louis G. Caldwell for the defendant in error, and the case submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Good, Mr. Robert W. Childs, Mr. Dwight S. Bobb, Mr. James B. Wescott, Mr. Delbert A. Clithero, and Mr. F. M. Hartman for the plaintiff in error.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Appellant,
143 vs.
The United States of America et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellee, and case submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Asa P. French and Mr. Leo A. Rogers for the appellant, with leave to counsel for the appellant to file an additional brief on or before Thursday next.

Armin A. Schlesinger et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
146 vs.
The State of Wisconsin et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles F. Fawsett for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. F. E. Bump for the defendant in error.

Isaac Wolfgang,
Plaintiff in error,
147 vs.
The People of the State of California et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ernest B. D. Spagnoli for the plaintiff in error, and case submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al., etc.,
Appellants,
567 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas Brown for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon, It is ordered that Hila Daly-Fleming, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, It is ordered that Max A. Sturm, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, It is ordered that William F. Noonan, Esquire, of Glenwood Springs, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carter B. Keene, It is ordered that Philip De Witt Phair, Esquire, of Presque Isle, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry B. Hawes, It is ordered that Fred L. English, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Sigmund W. David, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity, It is ordered that John Hamilton Bickett, Jr., Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Ellis Allison, It is ordered that W. Clark King, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hobert Crosser, It is ordered that Nicolo Lombardo, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Reba Fenwick, Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting Attorney,
Darke County, Ohio.

This cause was continued.

Randolph Henry, Trustee in Bankrupty, etc., Plaintiff in error,
158 vs.
W. A. Irwin et al.

This cause was passed for submission on briefs within sixty days, on motion of Mr. Harry St. George Tucker, in behalf by Mr. Randolph Henry; brief for the plaintiff in error to be filed within thirty days and brief for the defendant

Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al., etc., Appellants,
567 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas Brown for the appellants, by Mr. C. M. Bracelen and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Thomas Brown for the appellant.

Harman W. McMahon, Petitioner,
462 vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. T. Hoffman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Don Rose for the respondent.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company et al., Appellants,
150 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. C. Hine for the appellant, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, by Mr. R. Granville Curry for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. E. S. Ballard for Chicago, Lake Shore and South Bend Railway Company, and concluded by Mr. C. C. Hine for the appellant.

City of Fort Smith, Arkansas, Fagan Bourland, as Mayor of said City et al., Appellants,
151 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. V. M. Miles for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry B. Hawes, It is ordered that Ed L. Abington, Esquire, and Carl C. Abington, Esquire, of Poplar Bluff, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Perry Browning et al.,
Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing and for a stay of mandate was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Carroll Todd in behalf of Mr. Dan Moody.

Dan Bartoncini,
Plaintiff in error,
655 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. E. B. D. Spagnoli for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to extend the time to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of the parts of the record to be printed within one week from this date.

City of Fort Smith, Arkansas et al., Appellants, vs. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

151

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. E. W. Clausen for the appellee.

Charles D. Cole et al., Appellants, vs. Norborne Land Drainage District of Carroll County et al.

152

This cause was argued by Mr. W. J. Henderson and Mr. Cyrus Crane for the appellants and by Mr. William A. Franken and Mr. S. J. Jones for the appellees.

Wilbur Rogers, Appellant, vs. The United States.

153

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Blythe D. Watts, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Bennet, It is ordered that W. C. Hawley, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wilbur Rogers,
Appellant,
153 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney for the appellant, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney for the appellant.

National Contracting Company,
Appellant,
160 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

D. J. Burke,
Appellant,
161 vs.
Monumental Division No. 52,
Brotherhood of Locomotive
Engineers et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Cyrus C. Derr for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

General American Tank Car Corporation et al., Appellants,
162 vs.
Eudora S. Day, Sheriff and Ex-Officio Tax Collector for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sigmund W. David for the appellants, and by Mr. Harry B. Sneed for the appellee.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
163 vs.
A. J. Mullens.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. T. Hall for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew M. Neely, It is ordered that Julian A. Richardson, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Benjamin W. Miller, Esquire, of Bogalusa, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Harry Green, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, and Ilo Orleans, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, It is ordered that Creekmore Wallace, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David H. Leake, It is ordered that Wirt T. Marks, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
163 vs.
A. J. Mullens.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. T. Hall for the petitioner, by Mr. J. Albert Toler for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. H. T. Loyall for the petitioner.

Sovereign Camp, of the Woodmen of the World, Petitioner,
164 vs.
Alice C. Shelton.

This cause was argued by Mr. John H. Bickett, Jr., for the petitioner, no appearance entered for the respondent.

Convoy Steamship Company, Limited, Owner of the Steamship "Willdomino", her engines, boilers, etc., Petitioner,
167 vs.
Charles Pfizer & Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this case has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steamship "Willdomino", her engines, boilers, etc., Petitioner,
165 vs.
Citro Chemical Company of America.
Steamship "Willdomino", her engines, boilers, etc., Petitioner,
166 vs.
Charles Pfizer & Company, Limited.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George C. Sprague for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Francis Rawle for the petitioner, by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Francis Rawle for the petitioner.

George Harrison, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Western Rope and Manufacturing Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
168 vs.
Anna B. Chamberlain.

This cause was argued by Mr. Philip Kates for the petitioner, and cause submitted by Mr. Henry B. Martin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Steinem, It is ordered that Daniel J. Levowitz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. G. Smith, It is ordered that Charles C. Scott, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank R. Reid, It is ordered that Ralph H. Mengel, Esquire, of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Larsen, It is ordered that John Dekle Kirkland, Esquire, of Metter, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Jonathan H. Holmes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, It is ordered that I. P. Whitehead, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Philip J. Wickser, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, and George T. Stormont, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Kingman Brewster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. J. Wilson, It is ordered that Hugh Tullis, Esquire, of Vidalia, State of Louisiana, and Laurens T. Kennedy, Esquire, of Nachez, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that Asa B. Kellogg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mable Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that A. W. Henderson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barbour, It is ordered that Alexander T. Gordon, Esquire, of Louisa, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that William D. Smith, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

H. E. Crook Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
122 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Sidney Mandelbaum,
Appellant,
139 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The Liberty Warehouse Company, Plaintiff in error,
584 vs.
Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Marketing Association.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
339, 340 and 341.
vs.
Harry Ritcey, Master of the British Schooner, "Marjorie E. Bachman" bailee, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company, Petitioner,
604 vs.
State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
864 vs.
The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company and The West Side Belt Railroad Company.
The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company and The West Side Belt Railroad Company, Appellants,
865 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate and advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 8 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file stipulation to amend the record herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, and W. H. Bremner, its Receiver, Appellants,
767 vs.
Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that further consideration of the said motion be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case upon the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Perry Browning, William Coleman, James E. Dale, et al., Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper, E. A. McDonald, E. L. Bishop, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. The petition to be filed within thirty days.

It is further ordered that the mandate be stayed until action is taken upon the petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar S. Appleby et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
15 vs.
The City of New York et al.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
16 vs.
John T. Delaney, Commissioner of Docks,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that these cases be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, March 1st, at the head of the call for that day in order that they may be

Alexander C. Shaw, Attorney in Fact for M. R. Waterman, Petitioner,

852 vs.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arizona Commercial Mining Company, Petitioner,

853 vs.

Iron Cap Copper Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Gila County, of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Gila County, of the State of Arizona, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mildred D. Holt, Edgar Daniel, Dollie Daniel Walker, et al., etc., Petitioner,

855 vs.

Daniel Sons & Palmer Company and Daniel Sons & Palmer Company et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles E. Schaff, as Receiver of
the Properties of the Missouri,
Kansas & Texas Railway Company,
Petitioner,
856 vs.
Ella Daugherty, Administratrix and
Personal Representative of the Estate
of Emery Garfield Daugherty, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Straesser-Arnold Company,
Petitioner,
857 vs.
The Franklin Sugar Refining
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Marukiewicz,
Petitioner,
858 vs.
The Hanover National Bank of the
City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

American Refrigerator Transit Company and Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioners,
859 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Refrigerator Transit Company and Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioners,
859 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to file intervening petitions in this case in behalf of the States of New Jersey, Missouri and Texas,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
574 vs.
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wisconsin Lime & Cement Company,
Inc., Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court
141 vs. of the State of Illinois.
City of Chicago.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Appellant, Appeal from the District Court
145 vs. of the United States for the District
The United States of America of Massachusetts.
and James Higgins.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isaac Wolfgang,
Plaintiff in error,
147 vs. In error to the Supreme Court of
The People of the State of California the State of California.
and James A. Johnston, as Warden of the
State Prison of California, at San
Quentin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Port Smith, Arkansas,
Fagan Bourland, as Mayor of said
city et al., Appellants,
151 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone
Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Contracting Company,
Appellant,
160 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harman W. McMahan,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
Montour Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sovereign Camp of the Woodmen of the World, Petitioner,
164 vs.
Alice C. Shelton.

On writ of certiorari to the County Court of Frio County, of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Frio County, of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said County Court of Frio County, of the State of Texas, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the ~~said~~ County Court of Frio County, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. J. Burke, Appellant,
161 vs.
Monumental Division No. 52, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers etal., etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, with directions to dismiss the bill for lack of allegation disclosing any ground for Federal jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, February 1, until Monday, March 1 next.

Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian, Appellant,
232 vs.
Richard Mayer, Edwin Reis, Karl B. Strauss et al., etc.
Richard Mayer, Appellant,
233 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, Alien Property Custodian.
Edwin Reis, Karl B. Strauss and Anny Reis, etc., Appellant,
234 vs.
Richard Mayer and Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian.

On consideration of the motion to substitute Howard Sutherland, present Alien Property Custodian, herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, be, and he is hereby, substituted as a party appellant in case No. 232; as a party appellee in case No. 233, and as a party appellee in case No. 234.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
726 vs.
Jacob Katz et al.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
727 vs.
Jacob Katz et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error.

Edward F. Goltra, Petitioner,
718 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Seaboard Rice Milling Company, Plaintiff in error,
311 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in behalf by Mr. Lon O. Hocker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Luther Burns, and Mr. M. L. Bell for the defendant in

State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Morton J. Cressy for the defendants, briefs were filed on behalf of the State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The petitions for leave to intervene and for leave to file motion to dismiss the amended bill of complaint were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby and Mr. Frank M. Thompson for the State of Tennessee; by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby and Mr. North T. Gentry for the State of Missouri; by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby and Mr. Frank E. Daugherty for the State of Kentucky, and by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby and Mr. Percy Saint for the State of Louisiana.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia,
Appellants,
543 vs.
S. B. McNeely.
S. B. McNeely,
Appellant,
593 vs.
Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia.

On motion of Mr. Conrad H. Syme in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John Brunini as amicus curiae herein.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,
Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry L. Conn, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton C. Elliott in behalf by Mr. Hartwell Cabell, Mr. William O. Henderson, and Mr. Karl E. Burr for the appellant.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
171 vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

The resignation of James C. Davis, as Director General of Railroads, having been suggested,
It is ordered that Andrew W. Mellon, as present Director General of Railroads, be substituted as the party petitioner in this cause, on motion of Mr. David H. Leake in that behalf.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
26 Original. vs.
The State of New Jersey et al.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach and for the defendants, Mr. John R. Hardin, leave was granted to file motion to dismiss and answer of the defendants.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York, Petitioner,
778 vs.
Terry and Tench Company, Inc., et al.

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins in behalf of Mr. Albert Ottinger, Mr. H. Clarence Aiken, and Mr. William W. Dimmick for the petitioner.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia, Appellants,
543 vs.
S. B. McNeely.
S. B. McNeely, Appellant,
593 vs.
Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia.

The death of S. B. McNeely having been suggested and motion to substitute Louisia McNeely as Administratrix of the Estate of S. B. McNeely, deceased, as the party appellee in No. 543, and as the party appellant in No. 593, having been presented by Mr. G. P. Bullis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
805 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Donner Steel Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Dinneen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Emily Beauchamp, Administratrix of the Estate of Ralph Beauchamp, deceased, Petitioner,
861 vs.
Michigan Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Bresnahan and Mr. Elmer H. Groefsema for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Walter Doheny and Mr. Frank E. Robson for the respondent.

James F. Todd, Petitioner,
866 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Morton Howard Marr, sometimes called Pat Marr,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. K. Mahoney for

Rosannah Brown et al.,
Petitioners,
875 vs.
United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, Mr. Joseph L. Hull, and Mr. Frank Montgomery for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the respondent.

Cities Service Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
322 vs.
The City of Marysville, Kansas; Chas. F. Travelute, Mayor; Leonard Cole, et al., etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon, next friend of Lew Goon Wong,
Appellant,
646 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States Immigration Commissioner at Boston, Massachusetts.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
169 vs.
Solomon Novcek.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the defendant in error.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
170 vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr and Company, Inc.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
171 vs.
Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Sherlock Bronson for the petitioners, continued by Mr. Wirt T. Marks, Jr., for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. David H. Leake for the petitioners.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
172 vs.
Khleber Miller Van Zandt et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. D. Smith and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant, and cause submitted by Mr. Ellis Douthit for the appellees.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Plaintiff in error,
173 vs.
Kerbaugh-Empire Company.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Franklin Nevius for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk,

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Clark, It is ordered that Thomas B. Adams, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that A. L. Bulwinkle, Esquire, of Gastonia, State of North Carolina, and R. G. Sharpe, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Henry L. Sherman.
No. -- .

On motion of Mr. Harry F. Mela in that behalf, motion granted to direct the Clerk to amend the roll of attorneys to show change of the name of Henry L. Scheuerman to "Henry L. Sherman".

E. B. Engel, Petitioner,
189 vs.
J. O. Davenport et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen and Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the

National Paper and Type Company,
Plaintiff in error,
175 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Cornelius W. Wickersham for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

Emma White, Appellant,
177 vs.
The United States of America and Lucy Reeves.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. T. Gordon for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia,
Appellants,
543 vs.
Louisia McNeely, Administratrix etc.
Louisia McNeely, Administratrix, etc., Appellant,
593 vs.
Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hugh Tullis for Louisia McNeely, administratrix, continued by Mr. L. T. Kennedy for Louisia McNeely, administratrix, and by Mr. G. P. Bullis for the town of Vidalia.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Edwards, It is ordered that Gordon Saussy, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel. Charles Newman, Plaintiff in error,
211 vs.
William C. Hecht, U. S. Marshal.
The United States of America ex rel. Lewis Fishlander, Plaintiff in error,
212 vs.
William C. Hecht, U. S. Marshal.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

Perry Browning et al., Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper et al.

On motion of Mr. Chester I. Long in that behalf, leave was granted to submit motion for leave to file brief as amici curiae in behalf of Brown-Crummer Investment Company et al:, on March 1st next.

Ben C. Jones and Company,

Plaintiff in error,

927 vs.

The West Publishing Company.

Mr. James H. Hart, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filled in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

"BEN C. JONES & COMPANY,

Plaintiff in error,

No. 3611.

THE WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Defendant in error.

"I, FRANK H. MORTIMER, Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, do hereby certify that on the 5th day of March, 1921, the judgment of this court, affirming the judgment of the District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division, was entered; that, on the 15th day of June, 1921, a writ of error for the review of said judgment by the Supreme Court of the United States was duly sued out by Ben C. Jones & Company, plaintiff in error, and allowed by Honorable H. W. Walker, Circuit Judge, and issued from the Clerk's office of this Court, which writ of error was returnable in the Supreme Court of the United States on the 30th day of June, 1921; that the transcript of the record on said writ was forwarded by me to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States on the 25th day of June, 1921, to which transcript was annexed the original citation and writ of error; that acknowledgment of the receipt of said transcript by the clerk of said Supreme Court, dated June 28th, 1921, is of record in the files of my office relating to said case.

"IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have caused the seal of said Court to be hereunto affixed at the City of New Orleans, Louisiana, in said circuit, this 5th day of January, A. D. 1926, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred forty-ninth.

(SEAL)

(SIGNED) FRANK H. MORTIMER,
Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia, Appellants,
543 vs.
Louisia McNeely, Administratrix, etc.
Louisia McNeely, Administratrix, etc., Appellant,
593 vs.
Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Vidalia.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. G. P. Bullis for the Town of Vidalia, and concluded by Mr. L. T. Kennedy for Louisia McNeely, administratrix, etc.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
178 vs.
The A. F. Thompson Manufacturing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry Simms for the respondent.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, et al., Appellants,
179 vs.
Ambler Realty Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James Metzenbaum for the appellants, and by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T.Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, It is ordered that Charles Aaron, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Lester A. Maris, Esquire, of Ponca City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quiggle, It is ordered that Bert Vandervelde, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

D. D. Roberts and G. A. Collins,
Plaintiffs in error.
180 vs.
Town of Perry, Florida, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas B. Adams for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Oregon-Washington Railroad and Navigation Company,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
State of Washington.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. C. Spencer for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. R. G. Sharpe for the defendant in error.

Clarence H. Venner,
Appellant,
190 vs.
The Michigan Central Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the appellant, and by Mr. Samuel H. West for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Cobb, It is ordered that Violette N. Anderson, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, It is ordered that O. E. Swan, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henrietta First Moon,
Appellant,
191 vs.
Starling White Tail et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. A. Maris for the appellant, and by Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the appellees.

Towar Cotton Mills, Inc.,
Appellant,
196 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
203 vs.
Byrd J. Boone.

This cause was argued by Mr. Merritt U. Hayden for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick L. English for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank D. Scott, It is ordered that Charles B. Dwight, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Oras A. Shaw, Esquire, of Okemah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that Fred L. Van Dolsen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Nottingham, It is ordered that Frank I. Finkler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Gorman, It is ordered that Albert Arnold Brand, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Edgerton, It is ordered that Donald Grant Hughes, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Joseph Bunn Ramsey, Esquire, of Rocky Mount, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ashby Williams, It is ordered that John McIlhenny Smith, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Millers Indemnity Underwriters,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
Mrs. Nellie Boudreaux Braud (Mrs. E. J. Braud) and Ed J. Braud.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
47 vs.
Holt State Bank, Deposit Bank of Winona, Federal Land Bank of St. Paul et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Charles D. Cole, Mary Cole,
Herman Noelker, et al.,
Appellants,
152 vs.
Norborne Land Drainage District
of Carroll County, Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte: In the matter of The
State of Maryland,
(Case "A"). Petitioner.
23 Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, and of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that should the District Judge deem it proper to allow another amendment to the petition for removal, by which the averments necessary to bring the case within section 33 are supplied, he will be at liberty to do so. Otherwise the prosecution is to be remanded as upon a

Ex parte: In the matter of the
State of Maryland,
(Case "B"). Petitioner.
24 Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, and of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the matter of the
State of Maryland,
(Case "C"). Petitioner.
25 Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, and of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motions of the States of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee and Louisiana for leave to intervene and become a party defendant, to file a motion to dismiss the amended bill and otherwise to participate in the defense,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
on the relation of Charlie
Newman, Plaintiff in error, In error to the District Court
211 vs. of the United States for the
William C. Hecht, United States Southern District of New York.
Marshal for the Southern District
of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion, by counsel for the plaintiff in error, to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
on the relation of Lewis Fishlander
alias Lewis Wilson,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the District Court
212 vs. of the United States for the
William C. Hecht, United States Marshal Southern District of New York.
for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion, by counsel for the plaintiff in error, to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
726 vs.
Jacob Katz and George Senn.
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
727 vs.
Jacob Katz and Herman Feuerstein.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, March 8 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward F. Goltra,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States; Col. F. Z. Ashburn, Chief Island & Coastwise Waterways Service, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 26th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,
Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry L. Conn, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York, Petitioner,
778 vs.
Terry & Tench Company, Inc., and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the case placedon the Summary Docket, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
805 vs.
The United States.

It is here ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause upon the appeal.

It is further ordered by this Court that the cause be placed upon the Summary Docket and assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Donner Steel Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emily Beauchamp, Administratrix,
Petitioner,
861 vs.
Michigan Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James F. Todd,

Petitioner,

866 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morton Howard Marr, sometimes called Pat Marr,

Petitioner,

874 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rosannah Brown et al.,

Petitioners,

875 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
People of the State of California.

It is ordered by this Court that counsel for the plaintiff in error file as part of the record herein, printed copies of the petition for review presented to the Supreme Court of California on behalf of the plaintiff in error, Charlotte Anita Whitney.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Morse,
Appellant,
201 vs.
The United States.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. John H. Morse pro se, in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
296 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, of Lunenburg, Province of Nova Scotia, Master of the Schooner "Frances Louise," and lawful bailee, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
297 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, of Lunenburg, Province of Nova Scotia, Master of the Schooner "Frances Louise", and

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
298 vs.
Arthur L. Backman, of Lunenburg, Province of Nova Scotia, Master of the Schooner "Frances Louise", and lawful bailee, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
339 vs.
Harry Ritcey, Master of the British Schooner "Marjorie E. Bachman," Bailee for the true and lawful owner thereof, J. E. Bachman.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

340 vs.

Harry Ritcey, Master of the British Schooner "Marjorie E. Bachman", Bailee for the true and lawful owner thereof, J. E. Bachman, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

341 vs.

Harry Ritcey, Master of the British Schooner "Marjorie E. Bachman," and bailee for the true and lawful owner thereof, J. E. Bachman.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

501 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
716 vs.
Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
805 vs.
The United States.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee in support of the motion.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al.,
Petitioners,
741 vs.
Attleboro Steam & Electric Company.

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur M. Allen, Mr. Charles T. Sisson, Mr. Roland W. Boyden, and Mr. Frank D. Comerford for the petitioners.

James C. Davis, Agent and Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
223 vs.
Abraham Weiss, Administrator etc.

On motion of Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf, the resignation of James C. Davis, as Agent and Director General of Railroads, having been suggested,

It is ordered that Andrew W. Mellon, as present Director General of Railroads, be substituted as the party petitioner in this cause.

George H. Kelly and Frank W. Sullivan, copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Northwest Sales Company,
Appellants,
85 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States of America et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Eugene West, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Burk-Waggoner Oil Association,
Plaintiff in error,
67 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of Texas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for rehearing in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest G. Miller,
Plaintiff in error,
370 vs.
The City of Milwaukee.

On motion of Mr. John Walsh in behalf of Mr. A. W. Schutz for the plaintiff in error, the death of Ernest G. Miller having been suggested,

It is ordered that Fred A. Miller and Elise K. John, executors of the estate of Ernest G. Miller, deceased, be substituted as the parties plaintiffs in error in this cause.

C. W. Britton, as Receiver of the Midland Packing Company,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
Adam Andrews et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Stilwill and Mr. H. H. Stipp for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Healy for the respondent.

Rosario Maccieno,
Petitioner,
573 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
575 vs.
M. S. Baldwin, Suing by Next Friend, Marcus Baldwin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph D. Frank and Mr. F. W. Woxencraft for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondents.

Yip Wah and Harry Tom.
Petitioners,
879 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hennessy and Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondents.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
Wheeling Can Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Palmer, Jr. for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday March 1st next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Henry W. Jessup, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and William H. Sawyers, Esquire, of Hinton, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Arthur H. Hull, Esquire; Paul G. Smith, Esquire, and John R. Geyer, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that Clarence M. Dinkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. McKenney, It is ordered that William L. Woodward, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Robert H. Kavanaugh, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, and Harry C. Hoyl, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Nehrbas, It is ordered that Henry C. Moses, Esquire, of New Rochelle, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard A. Hanson, It is ordered that George A. Meagher, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Sweeney, It is ordered that John Francis Anderson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Frank W. Morrison, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, and Rosa L. Leitman, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, It is ordered that Edwin Johnston, Esquire, of Pittsfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Joffe, It is ordered that Ernest A. Gordon, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Burkart, It is ordered that Alfred S. Niles, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, It is ordered that Oliver Senti, Esquire, and Charles P. Williams, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Gardner P. Lloyd, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and J. D. E. Meyer, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Joseph Otto Bronssard, Esquire, of Abbeville, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Ida May Adams, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that James Walter Scott, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Harreld, It is ordered that Solon W. Turk, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. S. Curtis, It is ordered that Ernest H. Van Fossan, Esquire, of Lisbon, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that James C. Martin, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Hubert Victor Spike, Esquire, and Thomas J. Green, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, and Emily C. Holt, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dewart, It is ordered that William S. Lewis, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

General American Tank Car Corporation, Elliott Jones & Company, Inc., Maryland Refining Company, et al.,

Appellants,

162 vs.

Eudora S. Day, Sheriff and ex-officio Tax Collector for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Risty, et al., as
County Commissioners, et al.,
Appellants,
95 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific
Railway Company.

Appeal from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Risty, et al., as
County Commissioners, et al.,
Appellants,
96 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company.

Appeal from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A.G. Risty, et al., as
County Commissioners, et al.,
Appellants,
97 vs.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis &

Appeal from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for
the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Risty, et al., as County Commissioners, et al., Appellants, vs. Northern States Power Company. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

98

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Risty, et al., as County Commissioners, et al., Appellants, vs. City of Sioux Falls. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

99

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;

and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota with directions to dismiss the plaintiff's bill.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Risty, et al., as County Commissioners, et al., Appellants, vs. Great Northern Railway Company. 100 — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Towar Cotton Mills, Inc., Appellant, vs. The United States. 196 — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Chamberlain Machine Works, Appellant, vs. The United States. 123 — Appeal from the Court ofClaims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
130 vs.
Isiddre Cohn.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Seaboard Rice Milling Company,
Plaintiff in error,
311 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and on motion to affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Fleischman Construction Company
and The National Surety Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
50 vs.
The United States of America to the use of G. W. Forsberg, Henry A. Kries & Sons, Wallace & Gale, et al.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States,
Appellant,
401 vs.
Reading Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Reading Company,
Appellant,
402 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from theCourt of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

405 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Southern Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard onthe transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

404 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico

Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

398 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The New York, New Haven &
Hartford Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

399 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Central New England Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

400 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The New England Steamship Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this

The United States,

Appellant,

499 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad

Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States,

Appellant,

500 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,

Appellant,

36 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconson.

Decree in favor of the State of Wisconsin, the costs to be equally divided between the parties. A form of decree to carry into effect the opinion of this court to be submitted within thirty days; failing which, a simple decree dismissing the bill will be entered. Opinion announced by Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Midland Land and Improvement Company,
Appellant,
105 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Georgine Iselin,
Appellant,
119 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Armour & Company,

Petitioners,

135 vs.

Port Morgan Steamship Company, Limited; The American Surety Company of New York, and Central American Cattle Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway Company, The Michigan Central Railroad Company, The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, etc., et al., Appellants,

150 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Chicago, Lake Shore & South Bend Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

170

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Westinghouse, Church, Kerr & Company, Inc.

171

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Marion & Rye Valley Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.

315

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company. 417

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

L. Littlejohn & Company, Inc.; General Silk Importing Company, Henry W. Peabody & Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 94

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

E. C. F. Sanchez, Eugene E. Sanchez, Mabel Sanchez, et al., Appellants, vs. Charles Deering, et al., etc. 134

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Armin A. Schlesinger, Henry J. Schlesinger, and Myron T. MacLaren, Executors, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The State of Wisconsin and County of Milwaukee. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

146

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sanford concurs in the result.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Henrietta First Moon, Appellant, vs. Starling White Tail and The United States of America. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

191

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

Decree entered. The parties to suggest within twenty days a form of decree giving effect to the conclusions of this Court, and to present an agreed calculation of the value of so much of the 706 acres of land specified as has been sold. Opinion announced by Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Emma White,
Appellant,
177 vs.
The United States of America and Lucy Reeves.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John H. Morse,
Appellant,
201 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby,

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
805 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
805 vs.
The United States.

ON CONSIDERATION of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, set for hearing on the Summary Docket on Monday, October 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Independent Wireless Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

This cause came on to be heard on petition for rehearing and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion and decree of this Court; the further proceedings to be taken shall be without prejudice, by reason of anything in the opinion or decree of this Court, to the right of the Independent Wireless Company to raise the issue, by answer or otherwise, whether the Radio Corporation has the rights as an exclusive sub-licensee, which it avers in its bill. With this reservation, the petition for rehearing is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Intercoean Oil Company,

Appellant,

115 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilbur Rogers,

Appellant,

163 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company,

Appellant,

328 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Indianapolis Union Railway Company, The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, and The Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
329 vs.
Indianapolis Union Railway Company, The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, and The Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Ely Goldsmith, Certified Public Accountant of the State of New York, Plaintiff in error,
320 vs.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon-Washington Railroad &
Navigation Company,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States,
Appellant,
288 vs.
Swift & Company.

Swift & Company,
Appellant,
289 vs.
The United States.

Appeal and cross-appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed for the amount already allowed by it; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to allow the additional amount now awarded on the cross-appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Girard Trust Company, George
Stevenson, William B. Verner,
et al., etc.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

137 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust
Company, Executor of George
Briggs, deceased,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

106 vs.

Rufus A. Doughton, Commissioner
of Revenue of The State of
North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al., Petitioners, vs. Attleboro Steam & Electric Company. 741

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, et al., Appellants, vs. Ambler Realty Company. 179

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rosario Maccieno, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 873

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause coming on to be heard, and it appearing to the Court that counsel for the respondent has confessed error,

Therefore, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rosario Maccieno, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 873

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

172 vs.

Khleber Miller Van Zandt and the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Paper & Type Company,

Plaintiff in error,

175 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. D. Roberts and G. A. Collins,

Plaintiffs inerror,

180 vs.

Town of Perry, Florida, G. P. Diamond, Mayor, John E. Powell, etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Floriad.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Britton, as Receiver of
the Midland Packing Company,
Petitioner,
868 vs.
Adam Andrews et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
878 vs.
M. S. Baldwin, Suing by next
friend, Marcus Baldwin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yip Wah and Harry Tom,
Petitioners,
879 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
Wheeling Can Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sperry Gyroscope Company,
Appellant,
239 vs.
The Arma Engineering Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the United States as amicus curiae in this cause.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
261 vs.
W. H. Mason.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

And it is further ordered that the mandate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company et al., Appellants,
345 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, Howard Sutherland, present Alien Property Custodian, ordered substituted as the party appellee in No. 345, and as a party petitioner in No. 764.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg, Petitioner,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

The United States of America, Appellant,
464 vs.
General Electric Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant.

The United States of America, ex rel. W. V. Hughes, Appellant,
515 vs.
Roy B. Gault, United States Marshal.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
831 vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texaway Mills, Petitioner,
860 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf leave was granted to file briefs for the United States in these cases.

E. A. Edenfield, Petitioner,
909 vs.
The United States of America.

John W. Thompson, Petitioner,
958 vs.
The United States of America.

Charles R. Forbes, Petitioner,
968 vs.
The United States of America.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
635 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. L. McNary in behalf of counsel.

Perry Browning et al.,
Appellants,
256 vs.
E. M. Hooper et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of Brown-Crummer Investment Company as amicus curiae in support of the petition for a rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long and motion denied. The motion for leave to file brief as amici curiae in support of the petition for a rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Clay and motion denied. The motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae on behalf of the State of Missouri in support of the petition for a rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. North T. Gentry and motion denied. The motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae on behalf of the State of Michigan in support of the petition for a rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Victor Spike and motion denied.

The motion for leave to file briefs as amici curiae on behalf of Mr. Andrew Squire, of Cleveland, Ohio; The State of Florida; The State of Louisiana; Mr. Moorfield Storey, of Boston, Massachusetts; Mr. Henry E. Cutler and Mr. Horace S. Oakley, of Chicago, Illinois; Mr. Chester B. Masslich, of New York City; and Mr. Frank C. Gaines for the Sovereign Camp of the Woodmen of the World, in support of the petition for a rehearing, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, and motion denied.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Benjamin Catchings, Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file motion for rule to show cause on the Secretary of State was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Catchings pro se.

James C. Davis, Director General, Agent U. S. Railroad Administration (Grand Rapids and Indiana Railroad), Appellant,
272 vs.
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver, etc.

On motion of Mr. F. E. Andrews for the appellant, Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads, ordered substituted as the party appellant in this cause.

Ex parte:
William Buder, Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James T. Blair for the petitioner.

Tyson and Brother, United Theater Ticket Offices, Inc., Appellants,
870 vs.
Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellant.

State of Michigan, Complainant,
-- Original. vs.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright in behalf of counsel.

Edmond Van Dyk, Petitioner,
678 vs.
William A. Young.

The motion for leave to file petition for a rehearing beyond the time prescribed by the rule submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend in behalf of Mr. William G. Cook for the petitioner, and motion denied.

Towaway Mills,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Mark J. Ryan in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Johnson and Shores as amici curiae.

Samuel W. Lambert,
Appellant,
501 vs.
Edward C. Yellowley, as Acting Federal Prohibition Director et al.

The resignation of William Hayward, as United States Attorney, suggested and motion to substitute Emory R. Buckner, present United States Attorney, as a party appellee, granted on motion of Miss Emily C. Holt for the appellant.

Samuel W. Lambert,
Appellant,
501 vs.
Edward C. Yellowley, as Acting Federal Prohibition Director et al.

On motion of Miss Emily C. Holt in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of the American Medical Society as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
First National Bank of
Saint Paul.

On motion of Mr. Walter Newton in behalf of counsel leave was granted to print and file opposition to motion to advance, on or before Friday next.

The Massachusetts State Grange
et al., Appellant,
967 vs.
Jay R. Benton, as Attorney
General of the Commonwealth of
Massachusetts et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. Morrison for the appellants.

Edward B. Graves et al., etc.,
et al., Appellants,
663 vs.
Cambria Steel Company et al.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Graves for the appellants, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer in behalf of Mr. Fred H. Wood for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The United States,
Petitioner,
908 vs.
The Louisville & Nashville Rail-
road Company.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of respondent on or before March 18.

Florida East Coast Railway
Company, Appellant,
256 vs.
Baker & Holmes Company, W. H.
Dowling, as Sheriff of Duval County,
Florida, Consolidated Engineering
Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Graves,

Plaintiff in error,

285 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a motion by counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oscar T. Hullman,

Plaintiff in error,

356 vs.

William W. Wheelock and William G. Beard, Receivers of the Chicago & Alton Railroad Company and Chris Adleman.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael McTernan, Plaintiff in error,

776 vs.

The City of Kansas City, Missouri.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Fetherbridge for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. James A. Reed and Mr. Francis C. Downey for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
846 vs.
George L. Wimberley, Jr., Administrator.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Ramsey for the respondent.

Texaway Mills, Petitioner,
860 vs.
The United States.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

North German Lloyd, Petitioner,
867 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar W. Hunt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the respondent.

Dunkley Company, Petitioner,
869 vs.
Central California Canneries et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Kemper Campbell and Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the respondent.

Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Petitioner,
880 vs.
Idaho Grimm Alfalfa Seed Growers' Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solon B. Clark for the respondent.

Riley Fry and Ernest Brown,
Petitioners,
881 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Ernest Brown, Petitioner,
882 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Scott Dillingham,
Petitioner,
889 vs.
The United States of America,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Pope Shepherd for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The People of the United States of America ex rel. Jacob Markin,
Petitioner,
891 vs.
Henry H. Curran, United States Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Camden R. Mattox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Matt Collins,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Simms for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
George Slayne, Steam tug Montauk and Long Island Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
Long Island Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

Christie-Myers Feed Company,
Petitioner,
897 vs.
Cleveland Grain & Milling Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Grandison Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. George M. Hoffheimer for the respondent.

Con M. Sullivan,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. G. Wilson,

William Mann,
Petitioner,
900 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. G. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Baltimore Steamship Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
901 vs.
Vernon Phillips, an Infant, by Vernon Phillips, His Guardian ad litem.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Chauncey G. Parker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Vernon S. Jones for the respondent.

Thomas B. Felder,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Walsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Clifford H. Byrnes for the respondent.

Samuel Marcusson,
Petitioner,
907 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. Michael Edelstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
908 vs.
The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner.

E. A. Edenfield,
Petitioner,
909 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Saffold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Clifford H. Byrnes for the respondent.

Mary Harrell, by her next friend, Zora C. Lamson,
petitioner,
910 vs.
The Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Shea for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, Mr. Joseph S. Hull, Mr. Thomas J. Flannelly, and Mr. Thomas S. Gibson for the respondent.

Grayson C. Powell, Trustee,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
U. H. Anderson, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred T. Sensny and Mr. I. W. Bountree for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
921 vs.
American Tobacco Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Bayard T. Rainer, and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
922 vs.
D. P. Trenholm, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben C. Dey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter L. Tooze, Jr., for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
923 vs.
Leah M. Gray, Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merrill Shurtleff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hollis R. Bailey for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
Anna Patterson, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Robert D. Dalzell for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Thomas Hoffman for the respondent.

Gould-Mercereau Company,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Williams Bros. Aircraft Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey S. Knight and Mr. Ernest G. Metcalfe for the petitioner, and by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the respondent.

The Northern Ohio Traction and Light Company,
Petitioner,
929 vs.
Erie Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. Ellis Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward A. Foote and Mr. Benjamin D. Holt for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Company, et al., Petitioners,
951 vs.
Great Falls Power Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals for the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Caton for the petitioners, and by Mr. John S. Barbour for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Abilene & Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
954 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Mr. C. C. Carlin, Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Jr., and Mr. M. Carter Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York et al., Petitioners,
955 vs.
M. Bright Wilson et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert Ottinger, and Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the petitioners, and by Mr. David W. Kahn for the respondent.

Donner Steel Company, Inc., Petitioner,
956 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the respondent.

James C. Waters, Jr., Petitioner,
959 vs.
The Pullman Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, and Mr. Arthur P. Drury for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
940 vs.
Charles Hendrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. Harry L. Ponder for the petitioner.

Edward Wuichet, Petitioner,
941 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee Warren James for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Joseph M. Jones, Trustee in Bankruptcy, Petitioner,
943 vs.
John T. Ready, Bankrupt, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Justice D. Bowerscok for the petitioner.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner,
944 vs.
Community Building Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Williams and Mr. William C. Prentiss for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. F. Post and Mr. Thomas Neill for the respondent.

J. Raymond McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States et al., Petitioners,
945 vs.
John F. Cox.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. L. Golze for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry C. Lank, Mr. John W. Price, and Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the respondent.

Town of Bridgewater, Virginia et al., Petitioners,
946 vs.
W. M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Courtby Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Helen Rauch, Petitioner,
947 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent.

Richard J. Whittaker, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
948 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted tothe consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox and Mr. C. Carroll Todd for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. S. Gunn for the respondent.

Christian J. Rasmussen,
Petitioner,
950 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lane Summers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Globe and Rutgers Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
951 vs.
Winter Garden Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach and Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Hughes for the respondent.

John W. Thompson,
Petitioner,
952 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, Mr. T. M. Pierce, Mr. A. M. Frumberg, and Mr. Randolph Laughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Ralph F. Potter, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Pickands, Mather and Company,
Petitioner,
954 vs.
H. A. and D. W. Kuhn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Andrews for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Nicholberger for the respondent.

William P. Puroglove,
Petitioner,
956 vs.
Monongahela Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Anderson for the petitioner.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
960 vs.
Barbara Ciechowski.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas R. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

State Industrial Board of the State of New York et al.,
Petitioner,
961 vs.
Johnson Lighterage Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert Ottinger and Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bertrand L. Pettigrew and Mr. Walter L. Glenney for the respondent.

Southern Surety Company of Oklahoma et al.,
Petitioners,
963 vs.
Nina H. Crawford et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the First Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Anderson and Mr. H. C. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maco Stewart and Mr. Brantly Harris for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. A. H. Jarman,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Jarman for the petitioner, and

Charles R. Forbes,
Petitioner,
968 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith and Mr. Elwood G. Godman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Ralph F. Potter for the respondent.

Henry A. Wise, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Christoffer Hannevig,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Russell Kettle, as Liquidator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Saul S. Myers and Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William St. John Tozer for the respondent.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in error.
15 vs.
The City of New York et al.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
16 vs.
John T. Delaney, Commissioner of Docks of the City of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland A. Newton, It is ordered that Julius R. Holte, Esquire, of Clayton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Walton Moore, It is ordered that Hugh Reid, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that Warren H. Lewis, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Williams, It is ordered that Leslie A. Welch, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Edward W. Wickey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that J. Fair Harbin, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, It is ordered that James G. Strong, Esquire, of Blue Rapids, State of Kansas; George E. Strong, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Thomas E. Lodge, Esquire, of Dover, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, It is ordered that Austin P. Canfield, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that J. Prentice Gross, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. J. Hughes, It is ordered that Edmund R. Beckwith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Melendez King, It is ordered that Henry Adam Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Stephen A. Burnley, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error.
15 vs.
The City of New York et al.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Charles J. Mehrbas for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiff in error.

Edgar S. Appleby and John S. Appleby,
Plaintiffs in error,
16 vs.
John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of
Docks of the City of New York.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector
of Internal Revenue, etc.
William H. Edwards, as Collector
of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the New York Life Insurance Company and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, for Edwards, Collector.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold Taylor, It is ordered that Daniel H. Ortmeyer, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
257 vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari or to affirm the judgment was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper in behalf of Mr. Julius J. Patek for the respondent.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa, Plaintiff in error,
26 vs.
L. B. Anderson, County Auditor et al.

On motion of Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in behalf of Mr. J. G. Gamble for the plaintiff in error, the resignation of L. B. Anderson, as County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, was suggested and Orlo D. Knapp, his successor as county auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, ordered substituted as a party defendant in error, nunc pro tunc as of January 4, 1926.

General Petroleum Corporation, Plaintiff in error,
624 vs.
County of Kern.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the defendant in error.

Pauline Andre De La Mettrie et al., Appellants,
346 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt De Gasquet James et al.

David Keane, Receiver, Appellant,
347 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt De Gasquet James et al.

On motion of Mr. Guy H. Johnson for the appellant, the death of Frederick G. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States was suggested, and Howard Sutherland, as present Alien Property Custodian of the United States, ordered substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. — Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Oscar J. Smith, Esquire, Of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Cashan P. Read, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Howe, It is ordered that Nathan A. Smythe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Fred. W. Breitinger, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that William B. Bowling, Esquire, of La Fayette, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,
Appellant,
288 vs.
Swift & Company.
Swift & Company,
Appellant,
289 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. G. Carroll Todd for Swift & Company the motion suggesting the form of judgment in this cause was granted.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector etc.
William H. Edwards, Collector etc.,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States and concluded by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the New York Life Insurance Company.

Joseph Jacob Tutun,
762 vs.
The United States of America.
Moritz Neuberger,
824 vs.
The United States of America.

These cases were argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for Tutun and Neuberger, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the United States.

Ephraim Lederer, formerly Collector, etc.,
180 vs.
Mary A. McGarvey, Executrix.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for Lederer, Collector, and the United States; continued by Mr. John W. Davis for Zerbey and the National Surety Company, by Mr. Levi Cook for McGarvey, Executrix, and concluded by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for Lederer and the United States.

The United States of America,
790 vs.
John E. Zerbey et al.

Hartsville Oil Mill,
Appellant,
609 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Christie Benet for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that George Kenney Bowden, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul S. Andrews, It is ordered that Edwin K. Cheadle, Jr., Esquire, of Lewistown, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Charles E. Woodward, Esquire, and Lee O'Neil Browne, Esquire, of Ottawa, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rainey, It is ordered that Harold J. Bandy, Esquire, of Granite City, State of Illinois, and Edmund Burke, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be, admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Hazen Bond, It is ordered that Harry W. Henderson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, It is ordered that Joseph O'Neill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Loeb, It is ordered that Howard E. Heinheimer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence P. Moser, It is ordered that Clarence Melvin Platt, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty, It is ordered that Edwin A. Meeres, Esquire, and John M. Breen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States,

Petitioner,

vs.

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

908

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steve Super and Benjamin H. Wilder, Appellants,
262 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, as a member of the Federal Power Commission, and Howard M. Gore, Secretary of Agriculture, etc.

On motion of Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the appellants, the resignation of Howard M. Gore, as Secretary of Agriculture, was suggested and William M. Jardine, present Secretary of Agriculture, ordered substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

Hartsville Oil Mill, Appellant,
609 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Christie Benet for the appellant, by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the appellant.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

Three hours allowed for the oral argument of this cause. The argument was commenced by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., for the complainant; continued by Mr. Ansen Getman for the State of New York, by Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland for the Ontario Beach Hotel and Amusement Company, and concluded by Mr. Edwin H. Abbott, Jr., for the complainant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel H. Gardner, It is ordered that Hillsworth Jordan, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Williams, It is ordered that Thomas J. Rowe, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David H. Kincheloe, It is ordered that Joseph T. Harrington, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Marquette, It is ordered that Charles D. Hamel, Esquire, and L. Dana Latham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Plaintiffs in error,
295 vs.
The State of Oklahoma and the City of McAlester, Oklahoma.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Charles S. Burg, and Mr. Maurice D. Green for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. William J. Horton and Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the defendants in error.

Stanley F. Ashe, Warden of the State Penitentiary for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Appellant,
521 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Valotta.

This cause was argued by Mr. James O. Campbell for the appellant, and by Mr. George R. Wallace for the appellee.

Frank L. Smith, Cicero L. Lindly, et al., etc., et al., Appellants,
193 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.
Frank L. Smith, Cicero L. Lindly, et al., etc., Appellants,
670 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry O. Heyl for the appellants, continued by Mr. William D. Bangs for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. R. H. Radley for the appellants.

Old Colony Trust Company, as Trustee, Appellant,
194 vs.
The City of Seattle, County of King, et al., etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Howard A. Hanson for the City of Seattle and County of King, and by Mr. George A. Meagher for Shields, as Treasurer, etc., and cause submitted by Mr. James B. Howe for the appellant.

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1926 - CONTINUED.

The State of Colorado,
Appellant,
195 vs.
The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission,
and the Colorado and Southern
Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Barney L. Whatley for the appellant, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and by Mr. R. Granville Curry for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 8th next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nicholas Kelley, It is ordered that Harold M. Wilkie, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, It is ordered that Raymond T. Jackson, Esquire, of Mineral Point, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Curtis, It is ordered that Sidney Kansas, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin B. Bauman, It is ordered that Noel S. Symons, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, and Chester Ammen Snow, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gower, It is ordered that Burt D. Whedon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Small, It is ordered that Alexander J. Feild, Esquire, and Harper A. Holt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore E. Burton, It is ordered that Nathan E. Cook, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that John R. K. Scott, Esquire, and Benjamin M. Golder, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and George F. Brumm, Esquire, of Minersville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion Butler, It is ordered that Philip Charles Cooke, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. The A. P. Thompson Manufacturing Company. 178

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

D. E. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection in Pittsburgh of the Department of Labor and Industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Appellant,
vs.
The Palmer Brothers Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

510

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

The Alexander Milburn Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Davis-Bournonville Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

107

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:	On consideration of the motion for
In the Matter of Benjamin	leave to file motion for rule to
Catchings, Petitioner,	show cause on the Secretary of
-- Original.	State,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan,	On consideration of the motion for
Complainant,	leave to file bill of complaint
-- Original. vs.	in this cause,
The State of Illinois.	

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward B. Graves, Walter G.	On consideration of the motion to
Graves, Arthur C. Graves et al.,	transfer this cause to the United
etc., et al., Appellants,	States Circuit Court of Appeals for
663 vs.	the Second Circuit,
Cambria Steel Company, Midvale	It is now here ordered by this Court
Steel & Ordnance Company, Bethlehem	that the said motion be, and the same
Steel Company et al.	is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward B. Graves, Walter G. Graves, Arthur C. Graves, et al., etc., et al., Appellants,
663 vs.
Cambria Steel Company, Midvale Steel & Ordnance Company, Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael McFernan, Plaintiff in error,
776 vs.
City of Kansas City, Missouri.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced, and assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
257 vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. W. V. Hughes, Appellant,
515 vs.
Roy B. Gault, United States Marshal.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 19 next,

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
635 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
635 vs.
The Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the appellant in the above entitled cause, within thirty days from this date why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
464 vs.
General Electric Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tyson and Brother, United Theatre Ticket Offices, Inc.,
Appellant,
870 vs.
Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York, State of New York et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Massachusetts State Grange et al., Appellants,
967 vs.
Jay R. Benton, as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Petroleum Corporation, Plaintiff in error,
624 vs.
County of Kern.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
846 vs.
George L. Wimberley, Jr., Administrator.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toxaway Mills,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore Steamship Company and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioners,
901 vs.
Vernon Phillips, an infant, by Vernon Phillips, Guardian etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
921 vs.
American Tobacco Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
925 vs.
Losh M. Gray, Administratrix, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North German Lloyd,
Petitioner,
867 vs.
The United States.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dunkley Company,
Petitioner,
869 vs.
Central California Canneries, Griffin & Skelley Company, J. C. Ainsley Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Petitioner,
880 vs.
Idaho Grimm Alfalfa Seed Growers Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Riley Fry and Ernest Brown,
Petitioners,
881 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest Brown,
Petitioner,
882 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Scott Dillingham,
Petitioner,
889 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the United States of America ex rel. Jacob Markin,
Petitioner,
891 vs.
Henry H. Curran, United States Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Matt Collins,
Petitioner,
893 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
George Slayne, Steamtug "Montauk" and Long Island Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
Long Island Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christie-Myers Feed Company,
Petitioner,
897 vs.
Cleveland Grain & Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Con M. Sullivan,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Mann,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

900 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas B. Felder,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

905 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Marousson,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

907 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Harrell, by her next friend
Zora C. Lannom,
Petitioner,
910 vs.
The Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grayson C. Powell, Trustee,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
U. R. Anderson, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
922 vs.
D. P. Trenholm, as Administrator of the Estate of Ada Clare Trenholm, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
Anna Patterson, Administratrix of the Estate of George R. Patterson, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
886 vs.
Freights, Sub-Freights, Charter Hire and/or Sub-Charter Hire of the S. S. Mount Shasta.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant, leave was granted to file statement of points relied upon nunc pro tunc as of January 27, 1926.

Fred L. Woodworth, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Plaintiff in error,
343 vs.
Jacob Frey.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Appellant,
280 vs.
Swift and Company.

On motion of Mr. G. Carroll Todd for Swift and Company, the mandates in this cause were granted.

Swift and Company,
Appellant,
289 vs.
The United States.

The State of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
820 vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, Mr. O. A. Youngquist, and Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the petitioner.

First National Bank of Hartford, Wisconsin,
Plaintiff in error,
636 vs.
The City of Hartford.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the defendant in error and in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original.
The State of Illinois and The Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. C. S. Ferris in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of New York as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and The Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Andrew B. Daugherty in that behalf leave was granted to file briefs of the States of Michigan and Indiana as amici curiae in this cause.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
938 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the appellee.

Clark Motor Company,
Appellant,
937 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the appellee.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
903 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern in behalf of Mr. Raymond Fellows for the appellee.

Utterbach-Gleason Company,
Appellant,
904 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern in behalf by Mr. Raymond Fellows for the appellee.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,
Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry L. Conn, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Crabbe for the appellee.

Edward A. Noll,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Edward P. Buckenmeyer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. John G. Ewing for the petitioner.

Roger B. Wood, Trustee of Federal Line, Inc.,
Petitioner,
933 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe Pertich and Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Arthur Cobb for the respondent.

The Bank of Hawaii, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
942 vs.
Charles T. Wilder, Tax Assessor for the First Division of the Territory of Hawaii.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren Gregory, Mr. Louis J. Warren, and Mr. Walter F. Frear for the petitioner.

Archie Louis Hadsell and Clinton C. Coghlan,
Petitioners,
970 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archie Louis Hadsell pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twelfth Pennsylvania District, Petitioner,
972 vs.
International Salt Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry B. Twombly for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. et al., Petitioners,
973 vs.
R. L. Cauthen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. T. Miller, Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, Mr. C. B. Stuart, Mr. J. G. Sharp, Mr. M. K. Cruce, and Mr. Ben Franklin for the petitioners, and by Mr. P. C. Simons and Mr. R. W. Simons for the respondent.

Samuel Ross, Petitioner,
978 vs.
Edward B. McLean.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. Philip Krahler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert and Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman for the respondent.

U. Sherman Joines, Petitioner,
981 vs.
William M. Patterson et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Davisson for the petitioner.

Central State Bank of Corsicana, Texas, Petitioner,
982 vs.
The United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick and Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter F. Seay for the respondent.

John Defore, Petitioner,
987 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of General Sessions of New York County, State of New York, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joab H. Banton and Mr. Felix C. Benvenga for the respondent.

Gerald Chapman, Petitioner,
1020 vs.
H. K. W. Scott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray M. Wiley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh M. Alcorn for the respondent.

The State of Colorado, Appellant,
195 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and The Colorado and Southern Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. Granville Curry for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. Bruce Scott for the Colorado and Southern Railroad Company, and Concluded by Mr. Barney L. Whatley for the appellant.

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1926 - CONTINUED.

The Cherokee Nation,
Appellant,
198 vs.
The United States.

Harold Taylor, Trustee, etc.,
et al., Petitioners,
199 vs.
Harry W. Voss, Trustee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. H. Ortmeyer for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul S. Andrews, It is ordered that Walter Mandry, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harry P. Goldstein, Esquire, of Salem, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that Paul M. O'Donnell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Hazard, It is ordered that Loran Paul Winnings, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S. Burnell, It is ordered that Maurice L. Mendenhall, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of

Hartsville Oil Mill, Appellant, vs. The United States. 609	On motion of Mr. Wade H. Ellis in that behalf leave was granted to file memorandum of counsel for the appellant.
Harold Taylor, Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Harry W. Voss, Trustee. 199	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. D. H. Ortmeyer for the petitioners, by Mr. Henry B. Walker for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. D. H. Ortmeyer for the petitioners.
Frank Moore, President of the Odd-Lot Cotton Exchange of New York, Appellant, vs. The New York Cotton Exchange et al. 200	This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Coleman for the appellant, and by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellee.
Charles C. Childers, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, Appellant, vs. John Beaver et al. 202	This cause was argued by Mr. J. Berry King for the appellant, and by Mr. Joseph W. Howell for the appellees.
South Fork Brewing Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 204	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. David V. Cahill for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago. 16 Original.	On motion of Mr. James M. Beck in that behalf, two hours and forty-five minutes allowed for the oral argument of this cause.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Larner, It is ordered that J. Howard Neely, Esquire, of Mifflintown, State of Pennsylvania; Joseph F. M. Baldi, 2d, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and William H. Baden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, It is ordered that Hugh S. Johnson, Esquire, of Moline, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Robert Alexis Green, Esquire, of Starke, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Lowell Turrentine, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Edward C. Lake, Esquire, of De Queen, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Vaile, It is ordered that Paul M. Segal, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Hill, Jr., It is ordered that Reginald H. Waters, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. O. Leatherwood, It is ordered that Norris P. Crafts, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, 16 Original. vs. The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James M. Beck for defendant, The Sanitary District of Chicago, continued by Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the complainant, the State of Wisconsin, by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the complainant, the State of Ohio and the Great Lakes Carriers Association, by Mr. Hugh S. Johnson for defendant, The State of Illinois, and concluded by Mr. James M. Beck for defendant, The Sanitary District of Chicago.

Dwight Harrison, Plaintiff in error, 610 vs. The State of Ohio.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. John R. King for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Robert R. Nevin for the plaintiff in error.

William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.,

Petitioner,

375 vs.

Chile Copper Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner.

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devander,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle C. Michener, It is ordered that Francis Bernard DeVine, Esquire, of Ann Arbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, It is ordered that John T. Brady, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Albert W. Brobst, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon, It is ordered that Harry W. Siegel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William H. Edwards, Collector,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
Chile Copper Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine for the respondent.

The United States,
Appellant,
864 vs.
The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company, et al.
The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
865 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States and by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company et al.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
726 vs.
Jacob Katz et al.
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
727 vs.
Jacob Katz et al.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. William T. Connor for the defendants in error.

James Patterson, alias "Bossy" Patterson,
Plaintiff in error,
206 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This cause was submitted by Mr. William F. Denny for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John R. Saunders and Mr. Lewis H. Machen for the defendant in error.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., Appellant,
207 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. C. Daniels for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Ethel F. Donaghue, and Pinckney Lee Estes / Glantzberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that Howard L. Doyle, Esquire, of Decatur, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank R. Reid, It is ordered that Richard F. Locke, Esquire, of Glen Ellyn, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that John D. W. Bodfish, Esquire, of Hyannis, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that Samuel Bitman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Deneen, It is ordered that Russell B. Burt, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry W. Siegel, It is ordered that Louis Fried, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. F. G. Button. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

215

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., Appellant, vs. The United States. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. C. Daniels for the appellant, by Mr. Peter S. Carter for the appellant, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Peter S. Carter for the appellant.

207

The State of Missouri ex rel. Leon Hurwitz, Plaintiff in error, 209 vs. Emmett P. North et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. I. V. McPherson for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. North T. Gentry and Mr. J. Henry Caruthers for the defendants in error.

Roberts and Schaefer Company, Plaintiff in error, 210 vs. Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary, etc.

On motion of Mr. Paul O'Donnell in that behalf, leave was granted to withdraw the appearances of Mr. Richard S. Doyle and Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, as counsel for the plaintiff in error. This cause was argued by Mr. Paul O'Donnell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the defendant in error.

Reading Company, Successor of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, 213 vs. John L. Koons, Administrator.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John T. Brady for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John H. Geyer for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 15 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Harry J. Maleski, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Clarke Mason, It is ordered that Frederic L. Ballard, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, It is ordered that Clem J. Jones, Esquire, of Athens, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Albert B. Ferrera, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Summers Hardy, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and Elmer T. Bell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors ofthis Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Alfred S. Knowlton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Victor Levine, It is ordered that Maurice Klein, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Frank B. Hoffman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Harry Samuel Gleick, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Offatt, It is ordered that William Matthews, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, It is ordered that Eugene E. Horton, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that M. A. Matthews, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Isabelle Barnette,

Appellant,

149 vs.

Wells Fargo Nevada National Bank of San Francisco, Fred G. Noyes, Individually, and Fred G. Noyes, as Receiver, etc.,

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

Stanley P. Ashe, Warden of the State Penitentiary for the Western District of Pennsylvania,

Appellant,

521 vs.

The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Valotta.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,
88 vs.
Ed. C. Tafoya, Chairman, and Hugh H. Williams and Bonifacio Montoya, Members, Constituting the State Corporation Commission of New Mexico et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company, Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry L. Conn, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The State of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
820 vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 377, when the latter case is reached in the regular call of the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Hartford, Wisconsin, Plaintiff in error,
836 vs.
City of Hartford and State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No.377 when the latter case is reached in the regular call of the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
938 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 845 heretofore advanced and assigned for Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clark Motor Company,
Appellant,
937 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 845 heretofore advanced and assigned for Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
903 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 845 heretofore advanced and assigned for Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Utterbach-Gleason Company,
Appellant,
904 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 845 heretofore advanced and assigned for Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. A. Edenfield,
Petitioner,
909 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gould-Marsereau Company,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Williams Brothers Aircraft Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David W. Phillips, Collector,
Petitioner,
972 vs.
International Salt Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. Sherman Joines,
Petitioner,
981 vs.
William M. Patterson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. Noll,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Edward P. Buckenmeyer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Northern Ohio Traction &
Light Company,
Petitioner,
989 vs.
Erie Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal
Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
951 vs.
Great Falls Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roger B. Wood, Trustee,
Petitioner,
933 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America ex rel.
Abilene & Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
934 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of
New York, et al.,
Petitioners,
935 vs.
M. Bright Wilson, et al., Trustees.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Donner Steel Company, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
936 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Waters, Jr.,
Petitioner,
939 vs.
The Pullman Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
940 vs.
Charles Hendrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Wuichet,
Petitioner,
941 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bank of Hawaii, Limited,
Petitioner,
942 vs.
Charles T. Wilder, Tax Assessor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph M. Jones, Trustee,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
John T. Ready, Bankrupt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
Community Building Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Raymond McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States, et al., Petitioners, vs. John F. Cox.

945

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Town of Bridgewater, Virginia, et al., Petitioners, vs. W. M. Jardine, Secretary.

946

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America, ex rel. Helen Rauch, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

947

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard J. Whittaker, Administrator,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christian J. Rasmussen,
Petitioner,
950 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Globe and Rutgers Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
951 vs.
Winter Garden Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Thompson,

Petitioner,

952 vs.

United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pickands, Mather & Company,

Petitioner,

954 vs.

H. A. and D. W. Kuhn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William F. Pursglove,

Petitioner,

956 vs.

Monongahela Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
960 vs.
Barbara Ciechowski.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Industrial Board of the State of New York and Louis Anderson,
Petitioners,
961 vs.
Johnson Lighterage Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Surety Company of Oklahoma, et al.,
Petitioners,
963 vs.
Nina H. Crawford, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America, ex rel.
A. H. Jarman,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles R. Forbes,
Petitioner,
968 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry A. Wise, as Trustee,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Russell Kettle, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Archie Louis Hadsell, et al.,
Petitioners,
970 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
973 vs.
R. L. Cauthen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Ross,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Edward B. McLean.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central State Bank of Corsicana, Texas, Petitioner,
982 vs.
United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Defore, Petitioner,
987 vs.
People of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the New York Court of General Sessions, New York County, State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the New York Court of General Sessions, New York County, State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gerald Chapman, Petitioner,
1020 vs.
H. K. W. Scott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

South Fork Brewing Company, M. F. Murphy, George J. Breisinger, et al., etc., Appellants,
204 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dwight Harrison, Plaintiff in error,
610 vs.
The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Patterson, alias "Bossy" Patterson, Plaintiff in error,
206 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 22d until Monday, April 12th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the complainant, the time within which counsel may present proposed form of decree extended until May 15 next.

Independent Coal and Coke Company and Carbon County Land Company,
Petitioners,
984 vs.
The United States of America and Carbon County.

On motion of Mr. Harvey H. Cluff in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Utah as amicus curiae in this cause.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The reargument of this cause was passed until Thursday next by reason of illness of counsel. The cause is set for reargument on Thursday or ordered submitted on printed briefs if counsel do not appear that day.

Southern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
218 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

James C. Davis, Director General,
Plaintiff in error,
219 vs.

On motion of Mr. Edward P. Humphrey in that behalf, Andrew W. Mellon, present Director General of Railroads, was ordered substituted as a party plaintiff in error in this cause.

The Red Ball Transit Company,
Appellant,
911 vs.
Charles C. Marshall, et al., etc.

The motion for a temporary injunction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ewing H. Scott in behalf of Mr. George Headly and Mr. Benton S. Oppenheimer for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. C. Crabbe and Mr. John W. Bricker for the appellees in opposition thereto.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,
Appellant,
386 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Stevenson for the appellant.

Marcella De Castro, lawful wife and heir,
Petitioner,
971 vs.
Antonia Fernandez, as administratrix and as claimant good faith wife and heir et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clement L. Bouve for the petitioner.

Gano Lee, an incompetent person, by his guardian and next friend, John F. Egan,
Petitioner,
976 vs.
The March Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, Mr. Joseph C. Stone, and Mr. Charles A. Moon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Lyons for the respondent.

Salina Land Company,
Petitioner,
977 vs.
The March Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, Mr. Joseph C. Stone, and Mr. Charles A. Moon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Lyons for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General Of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Oswald and Taube, a Partnership etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Hoadly and Mr. Edward Colston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Bettman for the respondent.

Mary C. Boland et al.,
Petitioners,
980 vs.
Elizabeth C. Hill et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan, Mr. Daniel W. O'Donoghue, and Mr. Arthur A.Alexander for the petitioners, and by Mr. Leo P. Harlow for the respondents.

Independent Coal and Coke Company and Carbon County Land Company,
Petitioners,
984 vs.
The United States of America and Carbon County.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Riter and Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the respondents.

Edward C. Twist,
Petitioner,
985 vs.
Prairie Oil and Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Hayden Linebaugh for the petitioner.

Edward C. Twist et al.,
Petitioners,
986 vs.
Prairie Oil and Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the EighthCircuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Hayden Linebaugh for the petitioner.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway Company, Petitioner,
988 vs.
J. L. Carter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Brown and Mr. Joseph M. Bryson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Stephens for the respondent.

Dennis B. Chapin,
Petitioner,
989 vs.
D. A. Walker, United States Marshal for the Western District of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Chambers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner,
990 vs.
John Hussey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Hoadly, Mr. Benton S. Oppenheimer, and Mr. Edward Colston for the petitioner, and by Mr. John C. Hermann for the respondent.

S. J. Faircloth,
Petitioner,
991 vs.
J. A. Lovett, Trustee in Bankruptcy of H. F. Lilly, Trading as H. F. Lilly and Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel McDougald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Omer W. Franklin for the respondent.

Dorothy Ferguson,
Petitioner,
997 vs.
The District of Columbia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty for the petitioner.

Diana N. Weil,
Petitioner,
998 vs.
Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Rambler Cafeteria, Inc., Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerome C. Jackson for the petitioner.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company et al.,
Petitioners,
999 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. Frederic R. Kellogg, Mr. Henry W. O'Melveny, and Mr. Walter K. Tuller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent.

Green River Gas Company,
Petitioner,
1000 vs.
R. A. White et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Augustus E. Willson for the respondents.

American Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
1002 vs.
The City of St. Louis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oliver Senti for the respondent.

Mary M. Dowling,
Petitioner,
1008 vs.
Sam Collins, Prohibition Director of the State of Kentucky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward C. O'Rear, Mr. William T. Fowler, and Mr. Wallace Muir for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Fort Worth and Denver City Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Mrs. D. J. Stovall, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis Douthit for the petitioner.

Fort Worth and Denver City Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1015 vs.
J. W. Williams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis Douthit for the petitioner.

Duras Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
Bakelite Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dora E.Rocker and William V. Rocker, Plaintiffs in error,
650 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company et al., etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Cox for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Velpeau Rocker for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Reading Company, Successor of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
John L. Koenig, Administrator.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. John H. Geyer for the respondent.

Pasquale Liberato et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
214 vs.
S. A. Royer and Albert Herr, Trading as Royer and Herr et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Hamlin Neely for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Arthur H. Hull for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Paul A. Kunkel for the plaintiffs in error.

Southern Railway Company,

Plaintiff in error,

218 vs.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads,

Plaintiff in error,

219 vs.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. J. P. Hobson for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman, It is ordered that John W. Keith, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Don F. Reed, It is ordered that Absalom M. Cunningham, Esquire, of Elkins, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, It is ordered that Williston M. Cox, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
218 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads, Plaintiff in error,
219 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. J. P. Hobson for the defendant in error.

Philip A. Luskett,
Appellant,
220 vs.
Delpark, Incorporated.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston for the appellant, continued by Mr. Archibald Cox for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
222 vs.
The National Exchange Bank of Baltimore, Maryland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. G. Ridgely Sappington for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles C. Baldwin for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
216 vs.
The P. Koenig Coal Company.
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
217 vs.
Michigan Portland Cement Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Humes, It is ordered that Stafford Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. McGovern, It is ordered that John Wilson Drye, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamilton, It is ordered that Albert B. Hall, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob Halper, It is ordered that Meyer Dworkin, Esquire, of Bridgeport, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert W. Jefferis, It is ordered that John H. Sherlock, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Arth, It is ordered that William R. P. Malony, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,
Appellant,
36 vs.
The United States.

The United States,
Appellant,
401 vs.
Reading Company.

Reading Company,
Appellant,
402 vs.
The United States.

The United States,
Appellant,
403 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
404 vs.
The St. Louis, Brownsville and
Mexico Railway Company.

Mandates granted on motion of Mr. J. Harry Covington in that behalf.

Millsaps College,
Plaintiff in error,
228 vs.
The City of Jackson.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
216 vs.
The P. Koenig Coal Company.
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
217 vs.
Michigan Portland Cement Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Harold Goodman for the defendant in error in No. 216, and concluded by Mr. Hal H. Smith for the defendant in error in No. 217.

The Minneapolis and St. Louis Railroad Company and W. H. Bremner, Its Receiver, Appellants,
767 vs.
Peoria and Pekin Union Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Donald Evans for the appellants, and by Mr. Eugene M. Horton for the appellee.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator, etc.
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Fred A. Elder.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Ayres, It is ordered that Robert Clare Faulston, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Garnett, It is ordered that John Lewis Abbot, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Raeburn White, It is ordered that Algernon R. Clapp, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
683 vs.
A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Clarence Y. Hope, deceased.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
684 vs.
Fred A. Elder.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondents.

Charlotte Anita Whitney, Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
The People of the State of California.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John H. Riordan for the defendants in error.

The United States, Appellant,
470 vs.
John J. Mitchell, et al., as Executors, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant, and continued by Mr. A. L. Humes for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that William Tudor Gardiner, Esquire, of Gardiner, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Terry Parker, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Clement Gunn,
Petitioner,
1015 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, the time within which to file brief for the respondent was extended to and including March 31 next.

The United States,
Appellant,
499 vs.
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

The United States,
Appellant,
500 vs.
The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

Mandates granted on motion of Mr. John F. McCarron for the appellee.

The United States,
Appellant,
470 vs.
John J. Mitchell et al.,
Executors, etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. A. L. Humes for the appellees.

Andrew W. Mellon, Agent and Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
223 vs.
Abraham Weiss, Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Keith for the respondent.

The Evansville Oil and Grease Company, et al.,
Appellants,
225 vs.
Ivy L. Miller as State Food and Drug Commissioner of the State of Indiana.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hubert B. Fuller for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Andrew G. Patterson et al.,
Individually, etc.,
Appellants,
226 vs.
Mobile Gas Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hugh White for the appellants, and by Mr. Harry T. Smith for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 22d next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. V. Morgan, It is ordered that Thomas Gillespie Walsh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that William Andrew Wallace, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, It is ordered that John C. Tobin, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Toomey, It is ordered that Harry Frieberg, Esquire, and Maurice J. O'Sullivan, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Jonathan C. Gibson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Neill Garrett, It is ordered that Michael J. Healy, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that Walter King Sibbald, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Harold R. Smith, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evan B. Lewis, It is ordered that John Jeffries, 5th, Esquire, of Milton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Frederick W. Magrady, Esquire, of Mount Carmel, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Byrd J. Boone.

No. 203

On writ of certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said St. Louis Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Wesley M. Smith,
Appellant,
22 vs.
W. P. McCullough, B. E. Beth,
Thomas F. Phillips, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, Second New York District, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Chile Copper Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The Red Ball Transit Company, Appellant,
911 vs.
Charles C. Marshall, et al., Constituting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio et al.

On consideration of the motion for a temporary injunction in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia, Appellant,
586 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dora E. Rooker and William V. Rooker, Plaintiffs in error,
650 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company and Fidelity Trust Company as Trustee of the Estate of Dora E. Rooker.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Evansville Oil and Grease Company,
Marland Refining Company of Indiana,
Inc., Western Oil Refining Company,
et al., Appellants,
225 vs.
Ivy L. Miller, as State Food and Drug
Commissioner of the State of Indiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dorothy Ferguson,
Petitioner,
997 vs.
The District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, overruled without prejudice to any question, and with leave to proceed in due course.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Independent Coal and Coke Company and Carbon County Land Company, Petitioners,
984 vs.
United States of America and Carbon County.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward C. Twist, Petitioner,
985 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward C. Twist, Albert T. Twist, and Jessie L. Payne, nee Twist, Petitioners,
986 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company, and Pan American Petroleum Company, Petitioners,
999 vs.
United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in

Marcella De Castro, lawful wife and heir, Petitioner,
971 vs.
Antonia Fernandez, as Administratrix and as claimant good faith wife and heir, Amada de los Reyes, as Claimant heir, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gano Lee, an incompetent person, by his guardian and next friend, John F. Egan, Petitioner,
976 vs.
The March Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Saline Land, Petitioner,
977 vs.
The March Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Appointed by the President under Section 206 (a) of the Transportation Act, 1920, Petitioner,

979 vs.

Oswald & Taube, a Partnership Composed of Henry Oswald and Arthur G. Taube.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary C. Boland, Rose M. McAuliffe, Emma Pairo, et al., Petitioners,

980 vs.

Elizabeth C. Hill, Mary A. McCarthy, Elizabeth Dolan, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway Company, Petitioner,

988 vs.

J. L. Tarter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dennis B. Chapin,

Petitioner,

989 vs.

D. A. Walker, United States Marshal for the Western District of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, and as Agent thereof under the laws of the United States,

Petitioner,

990 vs.

John Hussey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. J. Faircloth,

Petitioner,

991 vs.

J. A. Lovett, Trustee in Bankruptcy of H. F. Lilly, Trading as H. F. Lilly and Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Diana N. Weil,
Petitioner,
998 vs.
Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Rambler Cafeteria, Inc., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari To the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Green River Gas Company,
Petitioner,
1000 vs.
R. A. White and Vertie W. White.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
1002 vs.
The City of St. Louis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary M. Dowling,
Petitioner,
1008 vs.
Sam Collins, Prohibition Director of the State of Kentucky.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Mrs. D. J. Stovall, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Civil Court of Appeals Second Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Civil Court of Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District, of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1015 vs.
J. W. Williams.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Civil Court of Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Civil Court of Appeals, Second Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy et al.,
Plaintiff in error,
267 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

Max Henkels,
Appellant,
518 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees, the resignation of Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, having been suggested, it is ordered that Howard Sutherland, present Alien Property Custodian, be substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
1061 vs.
John Ramsey and William K. Hale.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error, the motion to advance this cause is granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 19 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Charles Barr,
Appellant,
1060 vs.
A. A. McCorkle, Warden and Keeper of the Tennessee State Penitentiary.

The joint motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Swiggart for the appellee in behalf of Mr. Grover McCormick for the

Benjamin T. Goldman,
Petitioner,
1003 vs.
John W. Christy et al.

On motion of Mr. Jo V. Morgan in behalf of counsel for the respondent, leave was granted to add the opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota to the Transcript of record in this cause.

A. J. Boyd,
Plaintiff in error,
871 vs.
Hon. James D. Smythe, Judge
of Henry County District Court,
State of Iowa.

The motion for supersedeas in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lloyd L. Duke for the plaintiff in error.

Winchester Repeating Arms Company,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

J. B. Nims,
Petitioner,
992 vs.
Fire Association of Philadelphia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick and Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioner.

Merchants Bank and Trust Company,
Petitioner,
994 vs.
C. L. Thurman Motor Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. R. Alexander for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. T. Kemmerly for the respondent.

The Lakewood Engineering Company,
Petitioner,
995 vs.
Calvin H. Stein et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Dennett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Rudolph William Lotz for the respondent.

Peter Madjorus,
Petitioner,
1001 vs.
State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jonathan Taylor for the petitioner.

Benjamin T. Goldman,
Petitioner,
1003 vs.
John W. Christy et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Grimes for the petitioner.

Hills Brothers,
Petitioner,
1004 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Deering and Mr. Dana T. Ackerly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Bayer T. Hainer, and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the respondent.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Incorporated, as Owner of the Steamship Pleiades, Her Engines, etc., Petitioner,
1005 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter F. Carter for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1006 vs.
Loma Fruit Company and International Navigation Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. H. Bristow, Mr. William Mann, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Homer W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irving Miller for the respondents.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1007 vs.
Loma Fruit Company and G. Warren and Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. H. Bristow, Mr. William Mann, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Homer W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irving Miller for the respondents.

DeForest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
1011 vs.
Edwin H. Armstrong and Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondents.

Moses H. Shire and Fannie F. Block, as Trustees, et c.,
Petitioners,
1021 vs.
Fred E. Hummel, as Trustee of the Estate of Gustave C. Strauss and Siegfreid Strauss, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Levitan and Mr. Joseph Slottow for the petitioners, and by Mr. Brode B. Davis and Mr. Charles R. Sercomb for the respondents.

Frank Hackethal,
Petitioner,
1024 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit wassubmitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold J. Bundy and Mr. Edmund Burke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Lloyds, a corporation, as Treasurer of Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 670 and Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 671, etc.,
Petitioner,
1028 vs.
Edith Bobe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Barry, Mr. A. G. Thacher, and Mr. J. K. Symmers for the petitioner.

Benjamin Gratz,
Petitioner,
1036 vs.
James S. McKee et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace for the petitioner.

Randolph Henry, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Free Service Pharmacy, Incorporated, Bankrupt,

Plaintiff in error,

158 vs.

W. A. Irwin and Thomas E. Payne.

This cause was submitted on briefs pursuant to order of this Court of January 19, 1926, by Mr. Randolph Henry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Harvey B. Apperson and Mr. Charles D. Fox, Jr. for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 12 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Louis G. Morten, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Helen Hardman, and Pierson M. Hall, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Alfred H. Crandall, Esquire, of Coudersport, State of Pennsylvania; Harris W. Coleman, Esquire, and Ashby M. Warren, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Finerty, It is ordered that Reuben Hall, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. S. Peters, It is ordered that W. Allen Perkins, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Anthony V. Lynch, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Karl Stecher, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Van Horne, It is ordered that H. Robert Burney, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bradley, It is ordered that Louis Mannheim, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Egan, It is ordered that Nathan A. Schatz, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas F. Summerall, It is ordered that Arny Moore Watkins, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Missouri at the relation of Leon Harwitz,

Plaintiff in error,

209 vs.

Emmett P. North, Franklin E. Murphy, Cortez F. Enloe, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Hartsville Oil Mill,

Appellant,

609 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Roberts & Schaefer Company,

Plaintiff in error,

210 vs.

Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State for the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Reading Company, Successor of Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
John L. Koons, Administrator of
Lester M. Koons.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

Decree for the defendants, costs to be paid by the complainant. The parties, or either of them, may, within thirty days, submit a form of decree to carry this opinion into effect, failing which a decree dismissing the bill, with costs, will be entered. Opinion announced by Mr. Justice Stone.

E. B. Engel,
Petitioner,
189 vs.
J. O. Davenport et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of California for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector
of United States Internal
Revenue for the First Collection
District of New York,

Petitioner,

295 vs.

Emma B. Johnson, as Administratrix
of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits
which were of John B. Johnson,
Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New York; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States,

Appellant,

470 vs.

John J. Mitchell, et al., as
Executors of the Last Will and
Testament of Dellora R. Gates,
Deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

George William Mottram,

Appellant,

142 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Evansville and Bowling Green Packet Company,

Appellant,

127 vs.

Chero Cola Bottling Company, National Produce Company, Raphael Brothers Dry Goods Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners and Harry V. Osborne, Joseph F. Autenreith, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

567 vs.

New York Telephone Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration of decision of this cause.

Frank L. Smith, Cicero J. Lindly, Hal. W. Trovillion et al., etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company. 193

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Frank L. Smith, Cicero J. Lindly, Hal. W. Trovillion, et al., etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company. 670

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Frank Moore, President of the Odd-Lot Cotton Exchange of New York,

Appellant,

200 vs.

The New York Cotton Exchange, The Western Union Telegraph Company, and The Gold & Stock Telegraph Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,

Petitioner,

683 vs.

A. D. Schendel, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Clarence Y. Hope, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Fred A. Elder. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

684

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Frank A. Harrigan, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of the Louis J. Bergdoll Motor Company, Petitioner, vs. Louis J. Bergdoll, now known as Louis J. Bergson. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

181

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Andrew W. Mellon, Agent and Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Abraham Weiss, Administrator of the Estate of Nathan Nominsky. — On writ of certiorari to the Municipal Court for the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts.

223

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Municipal Court for the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Municipal Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Municipal Court for the City of Boston, State of Massachusetts, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Jacob Joseph Tutun, — On a certificate from the United
762 vs. — States Circuit Court of Appeals
The United States of America. — for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified should be answered as follows: The Circuit Court of Appeals has jurisdiction to review by appeal the order or decree of the District Court denying the petition of an alien to be admitted to citizenship in the United States.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Moritz Neuberger, — On a certificate from the United
824 vs. — States Circuit Court of Appeals
The United States of America. — for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified should be answered as follows: The Circuit Court of Appeals has jurisdiction to review by appeal the order or decree of the District Court denying the petition of an alien to be admitted to citizenship in the United States.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company and W. H. Brenner, Its Receiver, Appellants, vs. Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company.

767 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles C. Childers, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, Appellant, vs. John Beaver and Benjamin Quapaw.

202 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
57 vs.
Charles W. Reed and Dora Reed, his wife.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court , in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The People's Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Johnstown Fuel Supply Company, and Joseph Cauffield, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The People's Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,
71 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Johnstown Fuel Supply Company, and Joseph Cauffield, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the States of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Pasquale Liberato and Anna Capon Liberato, by Their Attorney-in-fact, Giovanni Disanto,

Plaintiffs in error,

214 vs.

S. A. Royer & Albert Herr, Trading and Doing Business as Royer and Herr et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

222 vs.

The National Exchange Bank of Baltimore, Maryland.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Cherokee Nation,

Appellant,

198 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philip A. Luckett,

Appellant,

220 vs.

Delpark, Incorporated, and Parker, Ford and Dick, Incorporated.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

216 vs.

The P. Koenig Coal Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
217 vs.
Michigan Portland Cement Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy, James F. Daves, Harry B. O'Connor, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
267 vs.
The United States of America.

Upon consideration of the motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It is ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. O'Shaughnessy, James F. Daves, Harry B. O'Connor, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
267 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

It appearing to the Court that a motion to transfer this case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Barr,

Appellant,

1060 vs.

A. A. McCorkle, Warden, Keeper of the Tennessee State Penitentiary.

Upon consideration of the motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, It is ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Barr,

Appellant,

1060 vs.

A. A. McCorkle, Warden, Keeper of the Tennessee State Penitentiary.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Boyd,

Plaintiff in error,

871 vs.

Hon. James D. Smythe, Judge of Henry County District Court, State of Iowa.

On consideration of the application for a writ of supersedeas, for leave to file a bond herein, and the motion for leave to amend the petition in error,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, severally denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Boyd,

Plaintiff in error,

871 vs.

Hon. James D. Smythe, Judge of Henry County District Court, State of Iowa.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Randolph Henry, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Ree Service Pharmacy, Inc., Bankrupt, Plaintiff in error, vs. W. A. Irwin and Thos. E. Payne. — In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

158

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Wheeling Can Company. — Order allowing certiorari.

887

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Wheeling Can Company. — It is now here ordered by this Court that the order entered in this cause on March 1, 1926, denying a petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, vacated, thereby making consideration of the petition for a rehearing of the petition herein unnecessary.

887

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winchester Repeating Arms Company, Petitioner,
894 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Nime, Petitioner,
992 vs.
Fire Association of Philadelphia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merchants Bank & Trust Company, Petitioner,
994 vs.
C. L. Thurman Motor Company and C. L. Thurman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lakewood Engineering Company,
Petitioner,
995 vs.
Calvin H. Stein, Henry A. Geisel and Fred D. Stein, doing business etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Madjerus,
Petitioner,
1001 vs.
The State of Ohio,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio,

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin T. Goldman,
Petitioner,
1003 vs.
John W. Christy, James P. Thomson, Hattie S. Barber et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota,

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hills Brothers,

Petitioner,

1004 vs.

Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., as owner of the Steamship "Pleiades" her Engines, etc.,

Petitioner,

1005 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,

Petitioner,

1006 vs.

Loma Fruit Company and International Navigation Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1007 vs.
Loma Fruit Company and G. Warren and Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

De Forest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
1011 vs.
Edwin H. Armstrong and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Moses E. Shire and Fannie S. Block, as Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
1021 vs.
Fred E. Hummel, as Trustee of the Estate of Gustave C. Strauss and Siegfreid Strauss, Bankrupts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Hackethal,
Petitioner,
1024 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lloyds, a Corporation as Treasurer of Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 670 and Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 671, etc.,
Petitioners,
1028 vs.
Edith Bobe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gratz,
Petitioner,
1036 vs.
James S. McKee, Nellie Canon Bliven, Executrix of William E. Bliven, deceased et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington,

Appellants,

vs.

Joe Dukich.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

418

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs. And it is further ordered that the mandate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

vs.

Metal Products Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

687

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

And it is further ordered that the mandate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
801 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger, Mr. Robert Healy, and Mr. Arthur F. Mullen for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Thomas K. Fisher et al.,
Petitioners,
1056 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief for the respondent.

Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,
Appellant,
102 vs.
The United States.
The Firm of M. Jebsen, corresponding owner of the Steamship Company Carl Diederichsen for the use of Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,
Appellant,
103 vs.
The United States.

The joint request to restore these cases to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of Mr. William F. Norman for the appellants.

Middleton S. Borland, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod, and Kuhne, Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Carl Roehling et al., trading as Gebrueder Roehling.

On motion of Mr. Godfrey Goldmark in that behalf, the death of Middleton S. Borland having been suggested, The Equitable Trust Company of New York ordered substituted as the party petitioner in this cause.

Alexander Latzko et al.,
Petitioners,
1116 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee
in Bankruptcy et al.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee
in Bankruptcy, etc.,
Petitioner,
1117 vs.
Alexander Latzko et al.

On motion of Mr. Godfrey Goldmark in that behalf, the death of Middleton S. Borland having been suggested, The Equitable Trust Company of New York ordered substituted as the party respondent in No. 1116 and as the party petitioner in No. 1117.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
836 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner.

Arnold H. Brein,
Plaintiff in error,
840 vs.
The State Department of Health of the State of Connecticut et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Egan for the defendant in error.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
715 vs.
The United States ex rel. G. Thomas Birkenstock et al., executors, etc.

The motion to affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend and Mr. James Craig Peacock for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Newton K. Fox, and Mr. Ralph E. Smith for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

James-Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
259 vs.
Carrie M. Harry.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger Shale in behalf of Mr. William M. Acton for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George F. Rearick for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The stipulation of counsel to extend the time within which to file agreed form of decree was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew B. Dougherty, Mr. Carl D. Mosher, and Mr. Meredith P. Sawyer for the complainant, and by Mr. Herman L. Ekern and Mr. Robert M. Reiser for the defendant.

Carter Lynch, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc., Plaintiff in error,
310 vs.
Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railway Company et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Spurlock and Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles C. Moore for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Mrs. Elizabeth Huff, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
467 vs.
Irving Page, Receiver.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. E. Huff,
Plaintiff in error,
468 vs.
Irving Page, Receiver.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Engineering Company,
Plaintiff in error,
662 vs.
White, Gratwick, and Mitchell
Incorporated.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Laurence E. Coffey for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Adelbert Moot and Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg et al.,
Petitioners,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Grant for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Amos J. Peaslee for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Clarence C. Culver,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted pursuant to the 23rd rule by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George B. Shields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Leslie Albert Porter,
Plaintiff in error,
884 vs.
The City of Lewiston, William Thomson, Charles Augustus Parker et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Telegraph & Cable Company,
Petitioner,
890 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford Robinson and Mr. Francis R. Stark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Edwin S. McCrary, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the respondent.

Lucius L. Gilbert, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the American Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace S. Whitman and Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. Arthur Cobb for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
953 vs.
Charles A. Ludy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Hampton Barnes and Mr. John F. McCarron for the respondent.

Catherine M. Drexel,
Petitioner,
974 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

William Leather,
Petitioner,
975 vs.
The United States Speedway Park Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Joseph Henry Cohen for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
1009 vs.
Marion & Eastern Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioners.

Nelson B. Updike, Elmer A. Cope, Edward Updike, et al.,
Petitioners,
1010 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Alfred C. Ellick, and Mr. Anan Raymond for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of Himself and all other seamen, etc., Petitioner,
1012 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner and by Mr. Frederick Clayton Peterson for the respondent.

Clement Gunn, Petitioner,
1013 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vance J. Higgs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

C. A. Hudson and R. R. Brogan, Petitioners,
1016 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Murray Jackson, Petitioner,
1017 vs.
The State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the petitioner.

Nellie Truelson and her minor children, Caroleen and Darnell Lena Truelson,
Petitioners,
1018 vs.
Whitney & Bodden Shipping Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Adams and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioners, and by Mr. Palmer Pillans and Mr. H. Pillans for the respondent.

William P. Colbeck, Oliver Daugherty, Stephen Ryan, David Robinson, and Charles Smith,
Petitioners,
1022 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Rowe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Charles Lanham and Gustav B. Distmeyer,
Petitioners,
1023 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Rowe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1025 vs.
Catherine O'Rourke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas R. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1026 vs.
Felix O'Rourke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas R. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

John W. Le Crone,
Petitioner,
1029 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Baxter and Mr. Moses E. Clapp for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Harry for the respondent.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Petitioner,
1034 vs.
James D. Hay et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Andrews for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. B. Brooks for the respondent.

Henry L. Corbett,
Petitioner,
1035 vs.
Henry Vette et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. G. Bissell for the petitioner.

Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas, et al.,
Petitioners,
1037 vs.
Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Ashley for the petitioner.

Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration,
Petitioner,
1038 vs.
United States ex rel. Beila Duner et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Frank M. Parrish for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. Morris Jablow for the respondent.

C.H. Bohning et al.,
Petitioners,
1039 vs.
R. B. Caldwell, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis Doughit and Mr. Fred L. Wallace for the petitioner.

William S. Silkworth,
Petitioner,
1040 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan A. Smyth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Blaine J. Nicholas et al.,
Petitioners,
1041 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David V. Cahill and Mr. William C. Fitts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Edward A. McQuade et al.,
Petitioners,
1042 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David V. Cahill and Mr. James I. Cuff for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Ralph E. Tincher et al.,
Petitioners,
1043 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Belcher for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Hocking Valley Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1044 vs.
Bert F. Kontner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Rector for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. B. Newcomb and Mr. David F. Pugh for the respondent.

George Ford et al.,
Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Marion De Vries, Mr. George Roscoe Davis, and Mr. Louis V. Crowley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Milton Von Boston,
Petitioner,
1049 vs.
United Railways Company of St. Louis et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. H. Cullen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Bates and Mr. H. S. Priest for the respondent.

Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
1050 vs.
William L. Walz, Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Walters, Mr. Arthur P. Hicks, and Mr. James C. Murfin for the petitioner.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
1051 vs.
Ynchausti & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. H. Hedrick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the respondent.

Margaret Chabot Von Crome,
Executrix,
Petitioner,
1052 vs.
The Travelers Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Bacon and Mr. Edward W. Foristel for the petitioner, and by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the respondent.

Williams Steamship Company,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
1053 vs.
Brayton Wilbur et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Sprague, and Mr. Thomas A. Thatcher for the petitioner.

Empire Trust Company,
Petitioner,
1055 vs.
Charles Hazlitt Cahan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., Mr. Augustus L. Richards, and Mr. Bertram F. Willcox for the respondent.

Thomas K. Fisher et al.,
Petitioners,
1056 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel T. Hagan for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Charles C. Galloway et al.,
Petitioners,
1057 vs.
James Franklin Bell et al.,
Commissioners, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ or certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis H. Stephens, Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, and Mr. Arthur P. Drury for the respondent.

Arthur B. Shook,
Petitioner,
1058 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard L. Doyle and Mr. Charles C. Le Forgee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Katherine Lloyd Campbell for the respondent.

Charlie Gib,
Petitioner,
1062 vs.
Luther Weedin, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell and Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Kee How, alias Charlie Kee,
Petitioner,
1063 vs.
Luther Weedin, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell and Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Edgar M. Chapman et al.,
Petitioners,
1064 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cecil H. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

In re
J. A. Wolfson,
Petitioner,
1065

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener, Mr. Swagar Sherley, Mr. F. De. C. Faust, and Mr. Charles P. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amos R. Stallings for the respondent.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Carl Roehling et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry G. Hotchkiss and Mr. William H. White, Jr., for the respondents.

Marie Perry,
Petitioner,
1071 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. P. G. Michener for the respondent.

Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1116 vs.
Middleton S. Borland, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Brodek for the petitioner.

Middleton S. Borland, Trustee in Bankruptcy, Petitioner,
1117 vs.
Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

Israel Seligman,
Appellant,
674 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue etc., et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees. No brief filed for the appellant.

Yu Cong Eng and Co Liam for themselves and for the benefit of all other persons similarly situated and affected,
Petitioners,
623 vs.
W. Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Joseph William Hazell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, It is ordered that Bolon B. Turner, Esquire; Ben Jenkins, Esquire; Earle W. Wallick, Esquire, and H. H. Shinnick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew H. O'Brien, It is ordered that Matthew H. O'Brien, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Lees, It is ordered that William F. Stanton, Esquire, and Cornelius V. Cronin, Esquire, of Newburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger O'Donnell, It is ordered that William J. Peters, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam G. Bratton, It is ordered that Arthur T. Hannett, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, It is ordered that William S. Hamilton, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that Arthur F. Auer, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Connaughton, It is ordered that Margaret Williams, of Lebanon, State of Tennessee, and W. B. Browne, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royle Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Norwood J. Utter, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that John H. Engel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte Samuel P. Goldman,
No. --.

On motion of Mr. George T. Weitzel in that behalf, the motion to direct the Clerk to amend the roll of attorneys to show the change of the name of Samuel P. Goldman to "Samuel P. Gilman" was granted.

Yu Cong Eng et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
623 vs.
W. Trinidad as Collector, etc.,
et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews for the respondents.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Plaintiff in error,
612 and 613. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Asa P. French for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Essex Rubber Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. O. Richey for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Lucius E. Varney for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. F. O. Richey for the petitioner.

New York Central Railroad Company
et al., Plaintiff in error,
230 vs.
New York & Pennsylvania Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Parker McCollester for the plaintiff in error.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Mapes, It is ordered that Abraham Lincoln Gutman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Paul Donehoo, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, It is ordered that W. E. Cashman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Charles L. Childers, Esquire, of El Centro, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Grover C. Carter, Esquire, of Ozark, State of Arkansas, and David S. Partain, Esquire, of Van Buren, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Y. Bradley, It is ordered that Dorina Watts MacDougall, and Bion B. Libby, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Van Sant, It is ordered that Charles W. Parker, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Harold A. Prince, Esquire, of Grand Island, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene B. Van Veen, It is ordered that Robert E. Kline, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Washington,
Plaintiff in error,
243 vs.
Mike Korich.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington; and it appearing that both parties have failed to appear, and that no brief has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of the 21st rule of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
230 vs.
New York and Pennsylvania Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Parker McCollester for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. Thomas Raeburn White for the defendants in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
231 vs.
A. H. Murphy Et al., Partners, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. T. Boys for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. W. C. Stevens and Mr. A. J. Morris for the defendants in error.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, Appellant,
232 vs.
Richard Mayer et al.

Richard Mayer et al.,
Appellants,
233 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian et al.

Edwin Reis et al.,
Appellants,
234 vs.
Richard Mayer et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, continued by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for Richard Mayer, and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for Edwin Reis et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Elmer M. Leesman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Glenn H. Leland, It is ordered that Ernest J. Stebbing, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, It is ordered that Clarence B. Des Jardins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. White, It is ordered that Arthur L. Gilliom, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Magire and Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
252 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

Sun Shipbuilding Company,
Appellant,
257 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Scott for the appellant.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank E. Scott for the appellant, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frank E. Scott for the appellant.

Sperry Gyroscope Company,
Appellant,
239 vs.
Arma Engineering Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. Anthony Usina for the appellant, continued by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Melville Church for the appellant.

Dorris Motor Car Company,
Appellant,
241 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John E. Hughes for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Kenilworth Company,
Appellant,
240 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam G. Bratton, it is ordered that Pearce Codington Hodey, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. McSwain, It is ordered that Joseph A. Tolbert, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Lee W. Branch, Esquire, of Quitman, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: Michael A. Mussman. On motion of Mr. J. J. McSwain in that behalf, the motion to direct the Clerk to amend the roll of Attorneys to show the change of the name of Michael A. Mussman to "Michael A. Musmanno" was granted.

The Kenilworth Company,
Appellant,
240 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
244 vs.
Jackson and Eastern Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George B. Neville for the defendant in error.

John W. McCardle et al., etc.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
Indianapolis Water Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur L. Gillion for the appellant, The Public Service Commission of Indiana, and continued by Mr. Taylor E. Groninger for the appellant, The City of Indianapolis.

Proclamation bein made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Froe, It is ordered that Herbert Newton Joyner, Esquire, of Pittsfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Freeman, It is ordered that John Carroll Wallace, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Sweeney, It is ordered that Edward H. Kelly, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Kline, Jr., It is ordered that Charles Upton Shreve, 3rd, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that Josiah Stryker, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Ransom, It is ordered that William A. McInerney, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan 24 Fletcher, It is ordered that James Thomas Vocelle, Esquire, of Vero Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that William Johnston Lamont, Esquire, of Newburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

712 vs.

William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

804 vs.

New York Life Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

138 vs.

Galbreath Cattle Company and Annice W. Phelps, and Frances P. Belden, etc., et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dr. A. W. Boyd,

Petitioner,

365 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Sun Shipbuilding Company,
Appellant,
237 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kenilworth Company,
Appellant,
240 vs. On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings of facts,
The United States.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kenilworth Company,
Appellant,
240 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dorris Motor Car Company,
Appellant,
241 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
801 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians,
Petitioner,
836 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold H. Brein,
Plaintiff in error,
840 vs.
State Department of Health et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,
Appellant,
102 vs.
The United States.

The Firm of M. Jebsen, Corresponding Owner of the Steamship Company, Carl Diederichsen, for the use of Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,
Appellant,
103 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the request to restore these cases to the call for argument,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said request be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time within which to submit a form of decree in this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, pursuant to the stipulation of counsel.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
713 vs.
United States ex rel. G. Thomas Birkenstock and Gerald Ronon, Executors, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the Summary Docket and assigned for

James-Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company and A. A. Dickinson, Plaintiffs in error,
259 vs.
Carrie M. Harry.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carter Lynch, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Tennessee River Coal Company, Plaintiff in error,
310 vs.
Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railway Company and A. L. Roberson, Receiver of the Tennessee River Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Engineering Company, Plaintiff in error,
662 vs.
White, Gratwick and Mitchell, Incorporated.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg et al.,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed upon the Summary Docket and assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
635 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al.

The return to the rule to show cause in this case having been considered by the Court,
It is now here ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, placed upon the Summary Docket and assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Israel Seligman,
Appellant,
674 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, and David H. Blair, United States Commissioner, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Plaintiff in error,
612 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Marsino,
Plaintiff in error,
613 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
231 vs.
A. N. Murphy and T. O. Murphy, Partners doing business under the firm name and style of Murphy and Son.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
953 vs.
Charles A. Ludy.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself and all other seamen, etc.,
Petitioner,
1012 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, Pacific American Steamship Association, their members, etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Hudson and R. R. Brogan,
Petitioners,
1016 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings

George Ford, George Harris, J. Evelyn, et al., Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Telegraph & Cable Company,
Petitioner,
890 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucius L. Gilbert, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the American Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catherine M. Drexel,

Petitioner,

974 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Leather,

Petitioner,

975 vs.

The United States, Speedway Park Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, James E. Finnegane and West Virginia Coal Company,

Petitioners,

1009 vs.

Marion & Eastern Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nelson B. Updike, Elmer A. Cope,
Edward Updike, et al.,
Petitioners,
1010 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clement Gunn,
Petitioner,
1013 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Murray Jackson,
Petitioner,
1017 vs.
The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nellie Truelson and her minor children Caroleen and Darnell Lena Truelson,
Petitioners,
1018 vs.
Whitney & Bodden Shipping Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William P. Colbeck, Oliver Daugherty, Stephen Ryan, David Robinson and Charles Smith, Petitioners,
1022 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Lanham and Gustav B. Dietmeyer, Petitioners,
1023 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1025 vs.
Catherine O'Rourke.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1026 vs.
Felix O'Rourke.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John LeCrone,
Petitioner,
1029 vs.
Andrew W.Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, Frank White, United States Treasurer and James M. Proctor, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Petitioner,
1034 vs.
James D. Hay, H. C. McClenathan and Carol S. Weir, Commissioners of Water Works in the City of Erie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry L. Corbett, Petitioner,
1035 vs.
Henry Vette and Mrs. Henry Vette, his wife.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas, Weona Land Company, et al., Petitioners,
1037 vs.
Guardian Savings and Trust Company, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Henry H. Curran, Commissioner at the
Port of New York,

Petitioner,

1038 vs.

The United States of America, ex rel.
Beila Duner, Golde Duner, Michel
Duner, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. W. Bohning, J. F. Dreinhofer and
T. J. Deffebach,

Petitioners,

1039 vs.

R. B. Caldwell, Receiver of the First
National Bank of Ranger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Silkworth,

Petitioner,

1040 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blaine J. Nicholas, Earl H. Truesdell, and Louis Gilbough, Petitioners,
1041 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. McQuade and Francis X. Quillan, Petitioners,
1042 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph E. Tincher, Otto H. Biegel, D. J. Dillingham et al., Petitioners,
1043 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hocking Valley Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1044 vs.
Bert F. Kontner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milton Von Boston,
Petitioner,
1049 vs.
United Railways Company of St. Louis, Rolla Wells, de facto Receiver of the United Railways Company of St. Louis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leopold Zimmermann et al.,
Appellants,
628 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian.
Leopold Zimmermann et al.,
Appellants,
629 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian.
Deutsche Bank of Berlin, Germany,
Appellant,
630 vs.
Leopold Zimmermann et al.

The motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the appellants, in Nos. 628 and 629 and for the appellees in No. 630.

Schurman Brothers, a copartnership consisting of Morris Schurman and Joseph M. Schurman,
Plaintiffs in error,
920 vs.
The First National Bank of Skiatook.

On motion of Mr. John W. Townsend in behalf of Mr. Claude H. Rosenstein for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file statement of points relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed.

Jacob Joseph Tutum,
762 vs.
The United States of America.
Moritz Neuberger,
824 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. James A. Cobb in behalf of counsel, the mandates in these cases were granted.

Sperry Gyroscope Company,
Appellant,
239 vs.
Arma Engineering Company.

The motion for leave to file additional brief on behalf of the appellant in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and said motion was denied.

John L. Cranmer,
Petitioner,
1030 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. John G. Ewing for the respondent.

A. Goldstein,
Petitioner,
1066 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1068 vs.
Marian S. Jackson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Asa G. Briggs for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. M. Miner for the respondent.

Hardy Chocolate Company, Petitioner,
1072 vs.
C. C. Mengel and Brothers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Addison C. Burnham for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner,
1073 vs.
The State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Bryson, Mr. C. C. Huff, and Mr. Alexander H. McKnight for the petitioner.

Harold W. Letton, Petitioner,
1074 vs.
American Merchant Marine Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating and Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the respondent.

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, Petitioner,
1075 vs.
Daisy Halt, Administratrix of the Estate of Frederick Halt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Baxter, Mr. Charles A. Houts, Mr. H. N. Quigley, and Mr. David E. Keefe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able for the respondent.

Alma Coal Company and Kentland Coal and Coke Company, Petitioner,
1076 vs.
John F. Phillips and Susan J. Phillips.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Hager for the petitioner.

The Temco Electric Motor Company, Petitioner,
1077 vs.
Apco Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. A. Keller and Mr. Clifford L. Hilton for the respondent.

Herbert R. Wilkin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Harmony Theatre Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
1079 vs.
Heywood-Wakefield Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Brand and Mr. Walter I. McKenzie for the petitioner.

The Farmers and Miners Bank et al., Petitioners,
1080 vs.
The Bluefield National Bank et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Werth for the petitioner.

A. Stanley Copeland,
Petitioner,
1081 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Stanley Copeland, pro se.

Paolo Sacco, Administrator of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of Luigi Sacco, deceased,
Petitioner,
1082 vs.
The Delaware and Hudson Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. Fullerton for the petitioner.

Spencer Brown,
Petitioner,
1087 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hubert F. Fisher for the petitioner.

The United States of America ex relations, Edmund A. Varela and Carry B. Walsh,
Petitioners,
1088 vs.
J. Franklin Bell, Cuno H. Rudolph, and James F. Oyster, as Commissioners of the District of Columbia, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clayton B. Emig, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, and Mr. R. H. Yeatman for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. Golden Donaldson, Mr. Hayden Johnson, and Mr. Vernon E. West for the respondents.

The United States of America by C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
1089 vs.
George S. Davison.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Fraser for the respondent.

William Moirmot, J. Olsen, Peder Hansen, et al., Petitioners,
1092 vs.
Schooner Rosemary, Charles J. Donohaud, owner, and W. H. Burbidge, Master.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Morewitz for the petitioner.

John W. McCardle et al., as Members of the Public Service Commission of Indiana et al.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
Indianapolis Water Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Taylor E. Groninger for the appellant, the City of Indianapolis, and concluded by Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellee.

Road Improvement District No. 1 of Franklin County, Arkansas, et al., Appellants,
250 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Dave Partain for the appellants, and by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the appellee.

Joseph Leiter, Nancy Lathrop, Carver Campbell et al., Trustees, etc.,
Appellants,
251 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. B. Garnett for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument

Dorothy Scott,

Plaintiff in error,

253 vs.

J. A. Paisley et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Paul Donahoo for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, It is ordered that Frank L. Muhleman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stiles W. Burr, It is ordered that Brice Toole, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that Frank A. Little, Esquire, of Basin, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Letts, It is ordered that Robert Bartlett Dresser, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that Ulysses Grant Hahn, Esquire, of Bellefontaine, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle C. Michener, It is ordered that William Dwight Thompson, Esquire, of Racine, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Vance Hewitt, It is ordered that Alfred Newman Houston, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dorothy Scott,
Plaintiff in error,
253 vs.
J. A. Paisley, Mrs. Fannie Paisley, Claud Brackett et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Paul Donahoe for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Walter McElreath for the defendants in error.

Oscar Thornton, Shabie Thornton, Inman Thornton, et al.,
Petitioners,
255 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lee W. Branch for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
257 vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. N. Van Doren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper for the respondents.

Steve Super and Benjamin H. Wilder, Appellants,
262 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the appellants, and continued by Mr. George P. Barse for the appellees.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Glague, It is ordered that Franklin William Murphy, Esquire, of Wheaton, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forney Johnston, It is ordered that William H. Cocke, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Timothy D. Sheehan, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Ralph Gilbert, Esquire, of Shelbyville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Steve Super and Benjamin H. Wilder, Appellants,
262 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, as a member of the Federal Power Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George P. Barse for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the appellants.

Union Insulating & Construction Company, Appellant,
263 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock and Mr. George I. Haight for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

Lazarus G. Joseph and A. M. Jouredini & Bros., Petitioners,
449 vs.
John Boardman, J. M. Menzi, and The Bank of the Philippine Islands.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry D. Green for the petitioners, and by Mr. Isidor J. Kresel for the respondents. A motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isidor J. Kresel for the respondents, with leave to counsel for the petitioners to file a brief in reply thereto within five days.

Marion L. Frost and Wesley H. Frost, Copartners doing business under the name and style of Frost & Frost Trucking Company, Plaintiffs in error,
828 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Max Kholen for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Arthur C. Erdall, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Connaughton, It is ordered that Merle M. Johnson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Rhoads, It is ordered that David H. Bloom, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Vaile, It is ordered that Buford O. Wheeler, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edith Stege, William C. Dohrman, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, 270 vs. The City of Richmond, and G. W. Cushing.	This cause was continued per stipulation.
Marion L. Frost and Wesley H. Frost, copartners, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 828- vs. Railroad Commission of the State of California.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Max Thelen for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. Carl I. Wheat for the defendant in error.
The United States of America ex rel. W. V. Hughes, Appellant, 513 vs. Roy B. Gault, United States Marshal.	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellee.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, 1061 vs. John Ramsey and William K. Hale.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William S. Hamilton for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendants in error.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, 264 vs. Odell Mills, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ira S. Mills, deceased.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. H. C. Cooke for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Buck, It is ordered that Charles C. Wallace, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that William Allen Wiest, Esquire, of Klamath Falls, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, It is ordered that Harold C. McCollom, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Justin M. Chamberlin, It is ordered that Joseph Tyson McGill, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quiggle, It is ordered that Leonard Marsden Gardner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew H. Culwell, It is ordered that Harry E. Pickett, Esquire, of Douglas, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Adams, It is ordered that Guy Gordon, Esquire, of Roseburg, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Odell Mills, Administratrix.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. R. C. Cooke for the petitioner, by Mr. C. R. Harsh for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. W. R. C. Cooke for the petitioner.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al.,
265 vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer for the Kansas City Terminal Railway Company, and by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson for the Central Union Trust Company of New York.

Emelie W. Peacock,
Appellant,
266 vs.
Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Herbert Pope for the appellant, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Herbert Pope for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 O'Clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bertram G. Foster, It is ordered that Ira Milton Jones, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. M. Harvey, It is ordered that Charles Louis Carroll, Esquire, of Great Bend, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Lee Miles, Esquire, and Will G. Akers, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Martindale, It is ordered that Simeon Hyde, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, It is ordered that Oscar Blount Ralls, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19 1

No. —. In the Matter of Robert Blount Ralls. The motion to amend the Attorney Roll to show a change of name of Oscar Blount Ralls to Robert Blount Ralls is granted.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Horace Webster Johnson, Esquire, of Thorntown, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orlin H. Graves, It is ordered that Pedro J. Urbina, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that Milward W. Martin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Andrew G. Patterson, H. Fitzhugh Lee, and Frank P. Morgan, Individually etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Mobile Gas Company. 226

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified, as stated in the opinion, and, as so modified, is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Clarence H. Venner,

Appellant,

190 vs.

The Michigan Central Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

New York Central Railroad Company and Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in error,

230 vs.

New York and Pennsylvania Company.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said writ of error be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

New York Central Railroad Company and Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in error,

230 vs.

New York and Pennsylvania Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

New York Central Railroad Company and Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in error,

230 vs.

New York & Pennsylvania Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Union Insulating & Construction Company, Appellant,
263 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees, Maryan H. Hauser, John S. Scully et al., etc., Appellants,
628 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees, Maryan H. Hauser, et al., etc., Appellants,
629 vs.
Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Deutsche Bank of Berlin, Germany, Appellant,
630 vs.
Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees,

Steve Super and Benjamin H. Wilder,
Appellants,
262 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, as a member of the Federal Power Commission and William M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture, etc.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emelie W. Peacock,
Appellant,
266 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First Internal Revenue District of Illinois.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
1051 vs.
Ynchausti and Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Empire Trust Company,
Petitioner,
1055 vs.
Charles Hazlitt Cahan.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1068 vs.
Marian S. Jackson.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Carl Roehling, et al., trading as Gebrueder Roehling.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
1073 vs.
The State of Texas.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Temco Electric Motor Company,
Petitioner,
1077 vs.
Apco Manufacturing Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1116 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, Petitioner,
1117 vs.
Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Cranmer, Petitioner,
1030 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1050 vs.
William L. Walz, Trustee, and Ann Arbor Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret Chaput Von Crome,
Executrix of the Estate of
Julius Kalter, Deceased,
Petitioner,
1052 vs.
The Travelers Insurance Company
of Hartford, Connecticut.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Williams Steamship Company, Inc.,
Claimant of the American Steamer
"Willsolo", her engines, etc.,
Petitioner,
1053 vs.
Brayton Wilbur, Floyd E. Ellis and
Thomas George Frank, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas K. Fisher, Dominick Fisher,
Peter E. Fitzpatrick et al.,
Petitioners,
1056 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles C. Galloway, H. Edson Rogers and Clarence D. Blachly,
Petitioners,
1057 vs.
James Franklin Bell, Cuno H. Rudolph and Frederick A. Fenning, as Members, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur R. Shook,
Petitioner,
1058 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charlie Gib,
Petitioner,
1062 vs.
Luther Weedin, as Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of Seattle, Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kee How, alias Charlie Kee,
Petitioner,
1063 vs.
Luther Weedin, as Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of Seattle, Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals to the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar M. Chapman and Ernest Lynn,
Petitioners,
1064 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re:
J. A. Wolfson, Petitioner.
1065.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Goldstein,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

1066

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marie Perry,
Petitioner,
vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

1071

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Handy Chocolate Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
C. C. Mengel & Bros.

1072

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold W. Letton,

Petitioner,

1074 vs.

American Merchant Marine Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company,

Petitioner,

1075 vs.

Daisy Halt, Administratrix of the Estate of Frederick Halt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alma Coal Company and Kentland Coal & Coke Company,

Petitioner,

1076 vs.

John F. Phillips and Susan J. Phillips.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert R. Wilkin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Harmony Theatre Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
1079 vs.
Heywood-Wakefield Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers and Miners Bank et al., Petitioners,
1080 vs.
The Bluefield National Bank, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Stanley Copeland, Petitioner,
1081 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paolo Sacco, Administrator of the goods, chattels and credits of Luigi Sacco, deceased,

Petitioner,

1082 vs.

The Delaware and Hudson Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Spencer Brown,

Petitioner,

1087 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, ex relatione, Edmund A. Varela and Carry B. Walsh,

Petitioners,

1088 vs.

J. Franklin Bell, Cuno H. Rudolph and James F. Oyster, as Commissioners of the District of Columbia, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America by C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

1089 vs.

George S. Davison.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Heirmot, J. Olsen, Peder Hansen, et al.,

Petitioners,

1092 vs.

Schooner "Rosemary," Charles J. Denohaud, Owner, and W. M. Burbidge, Master.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

410 vs.

Western Meat Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Swift & Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Charles V. Duffy, former Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

The Motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

George Ford, George Harris, J. Evelyn, et al.,
Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company et al.,
Petitioners,
999 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent.

Edmond Van Dyk,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
William A. Young.

The motion for leave to file petition for a rehearing in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend in behalf of Mr. William G. Cooke for the petitioner, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The United States,
Appellant,
470 vs.
John J. Mitchell et al., as executors, etc.

Mandate granted on motion of Mr. Milward W. Martin in that behalf.

Ex parte:
In the matter of William G. Ehrlich,
No. -- Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus and to admit petitioner to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Prentiss and Mr. Joseph E. Morrison for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Carl Kober,
No. -- Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus and to ad mit petitioner to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Prentiss and Mr. Joseph E. Morrison for the petitioner.

Ben L. Berwald Shoe Company, bankrupt, et al.,
Petitioners,
1083 vs.
Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Davis for the petitioner.

David S. Seaman et al., Co-executors, etc.,
Petitioners,
1084 vs.
Richard McCulloch et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. H. Cullen and Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel A. Mitchell and Mr. H. S. Priest for the respondent.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1086 vs.
W. F. Wells.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the petitioner.

Fred E. Kling,
Petitioner,
1090 vs.
Fritz Haring.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. P. Wolhaupter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Hussey and Mr. Ralph Munden for the respondent.

B. A. Marlin,
Petitioner,
1091 vs.
John Lewallen et al.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin E. Turner for the respondents.

Alvaro Boera et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1093 vs.
Steamship Skipsea et al.,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank I. Finkler for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. De Grove Potter for the respondents.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1094 vs.
Ida May Southwell, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration ofthe Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
1095 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Williamson, Mr. B. M. Aikens, and Mr. Barry Mohun for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. R. Stallings for the respondent.

Stromberg Motor Devices Company, Petitioner,
1103 vs.
Beneke & Kropf Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Brown and Mr. Arthur H. Boettcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Hills for the respondent.

Stromberg Motor Devices Company, Petitioner,
1104 vs.
Beneke & Kropf Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Brown and Mr. Arthur H. Boettcher for the petitioner.

City of Atlanta, Petitioner,
1106 vs.
Mrs. Corinne S. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will T. Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, Mr. Marion Smith, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the respondent.

Columbia Insurance Company of New Jersey et al., Petitioners,
1107 vs.
The Mart Waterman Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert J. Fox and Mr. Royal H. Weller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., for the respondent.

The Buckeye Iron & Brass Works, Petitioner,
1108 vs.
Alfred W. French et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Parker for the respondents.

James Murray, Petitioner,
1109 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhard Frank, Mr. Charles E. Woodward, and Mr. Lee O'Neil Browne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William J. Fahy, Petitioner,
1110 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhard Frank, Mr. Charles E. Woodward, and Mr. Lee O'Neil Browne for the petitioner.

Reaves Warehouse Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

327-

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas E. Wing, as substituted trustee, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
Ernest A. Wiltsee.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

342

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Horton,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Missouri.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

964

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Edith F. Coogan, as Special Administratrix of the Estate of William Coogan, Deceased.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. C. Erdall for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. D. Sheehan for the respondent.

Roy Rissling,
Plaintiff in error,
269 vs.
The City of Milwaukee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Leon B. Lamfrom for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Turner, Dennis & Lowry Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error,
271 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rees Turpin for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edward A. Haid for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is [illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Loys Charbonnet, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Scott Thompson, It is ordered that John H. Venable, Esquire, of Miami, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Michael McTernan,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court
776 vs. of the State of Missouri.
The City of Kansas City, Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Turner, Dennis & Lowry Lumber Company, Plaintiff in error,
271 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward A. Haid for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General, Agent, etc., et al., Appellant,
272 vs.
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver of Rathbone Manufacturing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews for the appellant, and by Mr. S. E. Knaplen for the appellee.

General Investment Company, Appellant,
274 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the appellant, and by Mr. S. H. West for the appellee.

Isabella Samuels, formerly Isabella Osborne, Alfred Samuels, and A. L. Emery, Plaintiffs in error,
275 vs.
Joe H. Childers.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John Tomerlin for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Edgar A. de Meules, and Mr. James C. Denton for the defendant in error.

R. H. Hassler, Inc., Plaintiff in error,
278 vs.
David C. Shaw.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Martindale for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. A. S. Harby for the defendant in error.

Edward F. Goltra, Petitioner,
718 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph T. Davis for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Albert MacC Barnes, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that J. H. Thayer Martin, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elliott H. Jones, It is ordered that Frank P. Barker, Esquire, and William B. Byers, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Woodcock, It is ordered that Arthur O. Cook, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, It is ordered that William P. Wendell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Samuel W. Lambert,
Appellant,
301 vs.
Edward C. Yellowley, as Acting Federal Prohibition Director et al.

On motion of Mr. Edward B. Dunford in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Anti-Saloon League of America as amicus curiae in this cause.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased, Appellants,
284 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Sophia C. Pitchlynn and others, heirs at law of Peter P. Pitchlynn, deceased, Appellants,
285 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company of Hartford,
Petitioner,
290 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Edward F. Goltra,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the respondents.

City of Douglas,
Plaintiff in error,
279 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry E. Pickett for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E. B. Stroud for the defendant in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
280 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Fred H. Wood for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the Appellee.

Shelley B. Hutchinson,
Appellant,
281 vs.
William M. Sperry and Emily Sperry, his wife, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Mayo Atkinson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that George H. Bookwalter, Esquire, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Vaile, It is ordered that Philip S. Van Cise, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that William Allen Tarver, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Alfred C. Prodel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Griffith, It is ordered that Roland Boynton, Esquire, of Emporia, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremy R. Waldron, It is ordered that Mayland H. Morse, Esquire, of Berlin, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. W. Hay,
Plaintiff in error,
292 vs.
The May Department Stores Company et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. James J. O'Donohue for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Robert A. Holland, Jr., for the defendant in error.

The United States,
Appellant,
282 vs.
Wyckoff Pipe & Creosoting Company, Inc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellant, and by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the appellee.

Charles E. Ruthenberg,
Plaintiff in error,
286 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

This cause was argued by Mr. Isaac E. Ferguson for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. O. L. Smith for the defendant in error.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
287 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. N. Davis for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

William H. Iselin et al.,
Appellants,
291 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Jaybird Mining Company,
Plaintiff in error,
293 vs.
Joe Weir, as County Treasurer of Ottawa County, Oklahoma.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. Scott Thompson for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John H. Venable for the defendant in error.

Fidelity National Bank and Trust Company of Kansas City et al.,
Appellants,
294 vs.
Felix H. Swope et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank P. Barker for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph Harrison, It is ordered that S. H. Williams, Esquire, and Duncan Drysdale, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Butler, It is ordered that Grosvenor H. Backus, Esquire, of Englewood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend, It is ordered that J. Mayhew Wainwright, Esquire, of Rye, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. W. S. Musgrave, It is ordered that John H. Hessey, Esquire, and Henry Zoller, Jr., Esquire, of Baltimore State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Walter E. Wiles, Esquire, of Sparta, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that William C. Henry, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Peery, It is ordered that Alfred Desot Duduit, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Ebb Aaron Berry, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abbot P. Mills, It is ordered that Dudley H. Dorr, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman H. Phleger, It is ordered that Joseph J. Webb, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Williams, It is ordered that David E. Blair, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. McDermott,

It is ordered that Edgar C. Bennett, Esquire, of Marysville, State of Kansas, and John A. Hall, Esquire, of Pleasanton, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Vandervort, It is ordered that William Burdette Matthews, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Homer Albers, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fidelity National Bank and Trust Company of Kansas City, et al., Appellants,
294 vs.
Felix H. Swope et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank P. Parker for the appellants, by Mr. Elliott H. Jones for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock for the appellant.

The Early & Daniel Company, Appellant,
299 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benton S. Oppenheimer for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Samuel W. Lambert, Appellant,
301 vs.
Edward C. Yellowley, as Acting Federal Prohibition Director et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach for the appellant, continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. M. A. Schenck for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Francis R. Bell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Winfield W. Gilman, It is ordered that Lynn Dole Joseph, Esquire, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Perry W. Howard, It is ordered that Louis R. Mehlinger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Blaine Hollock, Esquire, of Baker, State of Oregon, and Edwin L. Gavin, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Hampton Tucker, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., It is ordered that Benjamin G. Clanton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harold Taylor, Trustee under the will of Mary E. Erskine, deceased and Wilbur Erskine,
Petitioners,
199 vs.
Harry W. Voss, as Trustee of the Estate of Wilbur Erskine, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

George Harrison, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Western Rope & Manufacturing Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
168 vs.
Anna B. Chamberlain.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Plaintiff in error,

173 vs.

Kerbaugh-Empire Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The State of Colorado,

Appellant,

195 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Colorado and Southern Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America ex rel. W. V. Hughes,
Appellant,
513 vs.
Roy B. Gault, United States Marshal.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

William H. Iselin, James W. Cromwell, Lincoln Cromwell, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
291 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Early & Daniel Company,
Appellants,
299 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
410 vs.
Western Meat Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift & Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Ford et al.,
Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company et al., Petitioners,
999 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmond Van Dyk,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
William A. Young.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

William G. Ehrlich, Petitioner, No. -- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and to admit the petitioner to bail,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

Carl Kober, Petitioner,

No. -- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and to admit the petitioner to bail,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lazarus G. Joseph and A. N. Jouredini & Bros.,
Petitioners,
449 vs.
John Bordman, J. M. Menzi, and the Bank of the Philippine Islands.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, as improvidently granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Risaling,
Plaintiff in error,
269 vs.
The City of Milwaukee.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isabella Samuels, formerly Isabella Osborne, Alfred Samuels, and A. L. Emery, Plaintiffs in error,
275 vs.
Joe H. Childers.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shelley B. Hutchinson,
Appellant,
281 vs.
William M. Sperry and Emily Sperry, His Wife; Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of New York, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
287 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
287 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of South Dakota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1086 vs.
W. F. Wells.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. A. Marlin, Petitioner,
1091 vs.
John Lewallen and Lucy Condren.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1094 vs.
Ida May Southwell, Administratrix of H. J. Southwell.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
1095 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beal L. Berwald Shoe Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
1083 vs.
Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

Ben L. Berwald Shoe Company,
Bankrupt, Petitioner,
1083 vs.
Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David S. Seaman and Henry L. Seaman, Co-Executors under the Last Will and Testament of John W. Seaman, Deceased, Petitioners,
1084 vs.
Richard McCulloch, Henry S. Priest, Festus J. Wade, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred H. Kling,
Petitioner,
1090 vs.
Fritz Haring.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alvaro Boera and Ramon J. Boera,
Co-partners doing business under
the firm name and style of
Boera Brothers, Petitioners,
1093 vs.
Steamship "Skipsea", her engines,
etc., Compagnie Francaise de
Navigation A Vapeur (Cyp Fabre).

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stromberg Motor Devices Company,
Petitioner,
1103 vs.
Beneke & Kropf Manufacturing
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stromberg Motor Devices Company,
Petitioner,
1104 vs.
Beneke & Kropf Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Atlanta,

Petitioner,

1106 vs.

Mrs. Corinne S. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Columbia Insurance Company of New Jersey, Newark Fire Insurance Company, Inc., of Newark, N. J., Security Insurance Company of New Haven, Conn., et al., Petitioners,

1107 vs.

The Mart Waterman Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Iron & Brass Works,

Petitioner,

1108 vs.

Alfred W. French and The French Oil Mill Machinery Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Murray,
Petitioner,
1109 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Fahy,
Petitioner,
1110 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

The call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 7 next. The Court will take a recess from Monday, May 10, until Monday, May 24 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Graves,
Plaintiff in error,
1067 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. Walter Newton in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file statement of points relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Edward F. Brown,
No. -- Orig. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. McChord and Mr. Conrad W. Crocker for the petitioner.

Market Street Railway Company,
Appellant,
1171 vs.
Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
The Railroad Commission of California
et al.

Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"In the Southern Division of the District Court of the United States, In and for the Northern District of California, Division Three.

Market Street Railway Company, a corporation, Plaintiff, vs. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, a corporation, et al., Defendants.	IN EQUITY NO. 1422.

C E R T I F I C A T E.

This is to certify that in the above entitled action Wm. M. Abbott, Esq., K. W. Cannon, Esq., and Edward F. Treadwell, Esq., are attorneys of record from plaintiff, Market Street Railway Company, a corporation, that Leo H. Sussman, Esq., Allan P. Matthew, Esq., and J. M. Mannon, Esq., are attorneys of record for defendant, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a corporation, and that Carl I. Wheat, Esq., and Woodward M. Taylor, Esq., are attorneys of record from defendants, Railroad Commission of the State of California, Harley W. Brundige, Clyde L. Seavey, Edgerton Shore, Ezra W. Decoto and George D. Squires, constituting the Railroad Commission

of the State of California; that said action was brought to have adjudged null and void certain portions of certain orders of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, which purported to increase contract rates for electric energy and power furnished by defendant, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, to plaintiff, Market Street Railway Company; that the relief asked was an injunction to enjoin and restrain the collection of any sums of money under said orders; that on the 26th day of February, 1926, the above entitled court, the Honorable William H. Hunt, Circuit Judge, the Honorable Frank H. Kerrigan, District Judge, and the Honorable A. F. St. Sure, District Judge, sitting, made and entered its order and decree granting defendants' motions to dismiss plaintiff's amended bill of complaint and dismissing said suit; that on the 17th day of March, 1926, the plaintiff by its attorneys of record herein, duly filed its petition for appeal to the above entitled court, together with its assignment of errors and bond on appeal, and thereafter, on said date, said court made and entered its order allowing said appeal and issued its citation thereon.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the said court this 9th day of April, 1926.

(Signed) Walter B. Maling,

Clerk of the Southern Division of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Northern District of California, Division Three."

(SEAL)

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Louisville and Nashville Railway Company, Appellant,
557 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation, on motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter in that behalf.

John C. Rose,
Plaintiff in error,
66 vs.
The State of South Dakota.

This cause was submitted under the 23rd rule by Mr. U. S. G. Cherry and Mr. Holton Davenport for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Byron S. Payne for the defendant in error.

New York & Pennsylvania Company, et al., Petitioners,
1097 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Hayes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Sharswood Brinton and Mr. John Hampton Barnes for the respondents.

Mountain Lumber Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1098 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Hayes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter C. Noyes and Mr. George H. Richards for the respondents.

Frank Oreb,
Petitioner,
1100 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Oreb, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Fort Dearborn Coal Company, Petitioner,
1102 vs.
The Borderland Coal Sales Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter E. Sibbald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Norwood J. Utter for the respondent.

The Niagara Laundry & Linen Supply Company et al., Petitioners,
1114 vs.
I. T. Kahn et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Marty for the petitioner.

Charley Simpson, Petitioner,
1118 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Belcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

Ed Elman et al., Petitioners,
1119 vs.
O.A. Moller, Master, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Morewitz, Mr. Fayette B. Dow, and Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the petitioners.

Kushner & Gillman, Inc., Petitioner,
1120 vs.
Mayflower Worsted Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. M. Browne for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hodges for the

Joe Johnson et al.,
Petitioners,
1122 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Beard for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Byron M. Coon for the respondent.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
1123 vs.
Lighter M. L. C. No. 10, etc.,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Harper A. Holt, and Mr. Alex. J. Field for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Lotsch for the respondents.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
1124 vs.
Lighter Leviathan, etc.,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Harper A. Holt, and Mr. Alex. J. Field for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Lotsch for the respondents.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
1125 vs.
Lighter Southern Cross, etc.,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Harper A. Holt, and Mr. Alex. J. Field for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Lotsch for the respondents.

Bush Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
1126 vs.
Lighter Allan, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Harper A. Holt, and Mr. Alex. J. Field for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Lotsch for the respondents.

Richard H. Field,
Petitioner,
1127 vs.
The Kansas City Refining Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard H. Field for the petitioner.

Ng Lung ex rel. Low Hung Get,
Petitioner,
1129 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ng Lung, pro se, and by Mr. John W. Keith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Jack C. Kolbrenner et al.,
Petitioners,
1131 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore Mack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William Earl Dodge et al., Petitioners,
1132 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel T. Hagan and Mr. Peter W. McKiernan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Gulf, Colorado, & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1140 vs.
Mrs. Olena Moser, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. J. W. Terry, and Mr. C. M. Lee for the petitioner.

James Scott, Plaintiff in error,
455 vs.
Morris National Bank of Morris.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. J. McVann for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

C. A. P. Turner Company, Appellant,
302 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benton Baker for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Harold B. Fiske, Plaintiff in error,
305 vs.
The State of Kansas.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. M. Harvey for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. B. Griffith for the defendant in error.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

306 vs.

Annie Nixon, Administratrix of the Estate of Sam Joe Nixon, deceased.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. H. Williams for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Duncan Drysdale for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Randolph Harrison for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Howard M. Lewis, Esquire, of Plentywood, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Harry Tom King, Esquire, of Abilene, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Daniel A. Dunning, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, It is ordered that Samuel M. Driver, Esquire, of Waterville, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. O'Neill, It is ordered that Frank E. Barrows, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Wallace E. Crowley, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry P. Keith, Late Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the First Collection District of New York, Petitioner,
295 vs.
Emma B. Johnson, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits which were of John B. Johnson, deceased.

Mandate granted on motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf.

S. H. Davis, J. A. White, and Annie White, Plaintiffs in error,
316 vs.
Alice Williford, Allie Griffin, Rosie Williford, et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Charles J. Kappler for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance entered for the defendant in error.

William H. Maxwell and Globe Indemnity Company, Plaintiffs in error,
304 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Christie Benet for the plaintiff in error.

The Court declined to hear further argument.

Ed. Raffel,
307 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. George B. Martin for Ed. Raffel, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States of America.

Charles B. Penner, Alphous C. Beane, Edmund J. Glenny et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
John A. Boykin and James I. Lowry.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur G. Powell for the appellants, continued by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Thomas W. Hardwick for the appellants.

Jose Alejandrino, Petitioner,
309 vs.
Manuel L. Quezon, Isebelo de Los Reyes, Santiago Fonacier, et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioner. No brief filed for the respondents.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
713 vs.
United States ex rel. G. Thomas Birkenstock and Gerald Ronon, Executors, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. James C. Peacock for the respondents.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company and Tanglefoot Company, Appellants,
312 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry C. Howard for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. P. Blair, It is ordered that Jules Henri Tallichet, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, and A. B. Cole, Esquire, of Brownsville, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rice Hooe, It is ordered that B. D. Oliensis, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Arthur H. Stetson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Clagett, It is ordered that James P. Rossiter, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, and Robert E. J. Whalen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McDuffie, It is ordered that Charlie C. McCall, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Frank A. Bernero, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Marblehead Land Company,
Plaintiff in error,
325 vs.
County of Los Angeles et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Sacramento Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
330 vs.
Milton H. Salz, doing business as
H. Salz & Son.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

W. T. Waggoner Estate et al.,
Appellants,
332 vs.
Wichita County et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company et al., Appellants,
312 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harry C. Howard for the appellants, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr.

Booth Fisheries Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. Schneider for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
313 vs.	
Industrial Commission of the State of Wisconsin et al.	
Charles Hammer, Petitioner,	This cause was argued by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.
317 vs.	
The United States of America.	
Max Henkels, Appellant,	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Herbert R. Limburg for the appellant.
318 vs.	
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian et al.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, It is ordered that Ezra G. Benedict Fox, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Burkart, It is ordered that Emory H. Niles, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that Arvid B. Tanner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier, It is ordered that Javier Gonzalez, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Thomas A. Jenkins, Esquire, of Ironton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Haeussler Investment Company, Plaintiff in error,
338 vs.
Charles W. Bates.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Lambert E. Walther, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. Walter H. Saunders for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles W. Bates for the defendant in error.

Fruin Bambrick Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
481 vs.
Charles W. Bates.

This cause was submitted pursuant to stipulation of counsel providing that this cause shall abide the decision in case No. 338.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
348 vs.
The Minnesota Mutual Investment Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Gardiner P. Lloyd for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edwin H. Park for the defendant in error.

Max Henkels, Appellant,
318 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Herbert R. Limburg for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellees.

Wachovia Bank & Trust Company, Administrator, etc., Plaintiffs in error,
319 vs.
R. A. Doughton, Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina.

This cause was argued by Mr. William M. Hendren for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Dennis G. Brummitt for the defendant in error.

Home Furniture Company, George H. Park and James F. Kilcrease, etc., Appellants,
324 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, The Southern Pacific Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. P. Blair for the appellee, the Southern Pacific Company et al., and case submitted by Mr. Joseph U. Sweeney and Mr. Edward C. Wade, Jr., for the appellants, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline and Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for appellee, The United States of America, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for appellee, The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Morse Dry Dock and Repair Company, Petitioner,
326 vs.
Steamship Northern Star, her engines etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. H. Stetson for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Frank A. Bernero for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, It is ordered that Thomas C. Mapother, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, It is ordered that Talmage L. Smith, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Joseph P. Hector, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that H. Clair Jackson, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, It is ordered that Louis E. Spiegler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cordell Hull, It is ordered that Hulon Capshaw, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin N. Cherrington, It is ordered that Robert D. Murphy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas F. Summerall, It is ordered that John S. Kuzmack, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Clarence V. Opper, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc., Plaintiff in error,
173 vs.
Harbaugh-Empire Company.

Mandate granted on motion of Mr. Harvey D. Jacob in that behalf.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
326 vs.
Steamship Northern Star, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank A. Bernero for the respondents and concluded by Mr. A. H. Stetson for the petitioner.

Ma-King Products Company,
Appellant,
333 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This cause was argued by Mr. B. D. Oliensis for the appellant, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellee.

Berizzi Brothers Company,
Appellant,
334 vs.
The Steamship Pesaro, her engines, boilers, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the appellant, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Myron H. Walker, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. McChord, It is ordered that Conrad W. Crocker, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. LeFevre, It is ordered that William Saulsbury, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, It is ordered that John H. Matthews, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Loeb, It is ordered that Ralph F. Fuchs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Transom, It is ordered that Marle D. Crammond, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and William A. Hughes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that Wilford W. Neilson, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward H. Kelly, It is ordered that David H. Keedy, Esquire, of Amherst, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss, It is ordered that M. A. Diskin, Esquire, of Carson City, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph Leiter, Nancy Lathrop Carver Campbell, et al., Trustees, etc., Appellants, vs. The United States. 251

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
169 vs.
Solomon Novack.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

R. H. Hassler, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
278 vs.
David C. Shaw.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte: Edward F. Brown, Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Scott,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

455 vs. the State of Oklahoma.

Morris National Bank of Morris.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Ross,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court

66 vs. of the State of South Dakota.

The State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. P. Turner Company,

Appellant,

302 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Maxwell and Globe Indemnity Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. The United States of America. — In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

304

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Haeussler Investment Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Charles W. Bates. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

338

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fruin Bambrick Construction Company, Third Street Realty & Investment Company, Compton Hill Improvement Company et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Charles W. Bates. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

481

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Earl Dodge and Joshua T. Dodge, Petitioners,
1132 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
1140 vs.
Mrs. Olena Moser, Administratrix.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York and Pennsylvania Company, Armstrong, Forest Company, Inc., and West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, Petitioners,
1097 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the United States and The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mountain Lumber Company, The
D'Auteuil Lumber Company, Ltd., New
York and Pennsylvania Company,
Petitioners,
1098 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of
Railroads and Agent of the United
States and The Delaware and Hudson
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Oreb,
Petitioner,
1100 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Dearborn Coal Company,
Petitioner,
1102 vs.
The Borderland Coal Sales Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Niagara Laundry & Linen Supply Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1114 vs.
I. T. Kahn, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charley Simpson,
Petitioner,
1118 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ed Ekman, F. Kecknie, A. Knutsen and J. Tornberg,

Petitioners,

1119 vs.

O. A. Moller, Master of Steamship "Roxen", O. A. Moller, Rederiaktieb Transatlantic et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kushner & Gillman, Inc.,

Petitioner,

1120 vs.

Mayflower Worsted Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Johnson and Henry Pius, alias Hindlegs, Petitioners,

1122 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Dock Company,

Petitioner,

1123 vs.

Lighter "M. L. C. No. 10," her tackle, etc., Marine Equipment Corporation and Marine Lighterage Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Dock Company,

Petitioner,

1124 vs.

Lighter "Leviathan", her tackle, etc., The Atlantic Lighterage Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Dock Company,

Petitioner,

1125 vs.

Lighter "Southern Cross," her engines etc., The Atlantic Lighterage Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bush Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
1126 vs.
Lighter "Allan", her tackle, etc.,
Henry Gillen Sons Lighterage
Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard H. Field,
Petitioner,
1127 vs.
The Kansas City Refining Company,
The Kansas City Railways Company,
Fred W. Fleming, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ng Lung ex rel. Lew Hung Get,
Petitioner,
1129 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States
Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack C. Kolbrenner, Art Kolbrenner and Menard Kolbrenner, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1131

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from today until Monday, May 24th; from that day until Tuesday, June 1st; and from June 1st to Monday, June 7th upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

No petitions for writ of certiorari and no motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Tuesday, June 1st.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America, Complainant, vs. The State of Minnesota. 17 Original.

The proposed form of decree in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the complainant and by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, Mr. G. A. Youngquist, and Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the defendant.

Charles H. Spear, et al., constituting the Board of State Harbor Commissioners of the State of California, Plaintiffs in error,
1085 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Richard H. Wilmer on behalf of Mr. U. S. Webb for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file statement of points relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed.

The State of Nevada,
Complainant,
11 Original. vs.
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On motion of Mr. M. A.Diskin,of counsel for the complainant, with the concurrence of Mr. Alfred Sutro and Mr. W. H. Orrick, of counsel for the defendant, It is now here ordered that the designation of Francis Cunningham, Esquire, of Sparks, Nevada, and Leo A. Murasky, Esquire, of San Francisco, California, as Commissioners to take testimony and proofs in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, approved,

And it is further ordered by this Court that the said Francis Cunningham, Esquire, and the said Leo A. Murasky, Esquire, be, and they are hereby, appointed Commissioners to take such testimony and proofs as may be offered by the parties or either of them, in this cause,

And it is further ordered by this Court that each Commissioner appointed herein before assuming his duties shall take and subscribe an oath that he will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties devolving upon him as such Commissioner according to the best of his ability and understanding. Such oath to be filed with the Clerk of this Court,

And it is further ordered by this Court that the said Commissioners appointed herein shall have the authority to administer oaths, to subpoena witnesses, to certify proofs, and to employ and obtain the services of a competent stenographer, or stenographers, at the expense of the party offering the proofs. The stenographer, or stenographers, shall furnish the Commissioners with three typewritten copies of the said proofs, one copy of which shall be delivered to counsel for the complainant and one copy to counsel for the defendant, and one copy after verification by the Commissioners shall be filed with the Clerk of this Court as evidence in the case.

All maps, plats, and other exhibits offered and received by the said Commissioners shall be by them identified with an exhibit number and the signature of the said Commissioners attached to the said exhibit. All such exhibits shall be filed by the said Commissioners with the Clerk of this Court as evidence in the case.

And it is further ordered by this Court that any matter appearing in the public statutes of the States of Nevada or California, or in any other published reports of said States or of the United States pertaining to the issues herein shall be received as evidence without further or other authentication than the publication thereof, subject, however, to objections on grounds other than authentication.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the Commissioners appointed herein shall proceed with all convenient speed to take all proofs which may be offered by either party at such times and places as may be agreed upon by the said parties, or as may be designated by either of said parties upon ten days' notice in writing served upon the opposing party.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the said Commissioners appointed herein shall receive compensation for their services in amount to be agreed upon by the parties, subject to the approval of this Court.

And it is further ordered by this Court that each party shall pay the expense of taking the proofs offered in its behalf and the expenses of all witnesses summoned in its behalf. Witnesses shall be entitled to compensation at the same rate as witnesses in the United States District Courts.

And it is further ordered by this Court that upon final judgment of this Court the costs in this case shall be taxed as this Court may direct.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
1135 vs.
The Holyoke Street Railway
Company et al.

The motion for a temporary restraining order pending appeal and the motion to advance this cause for argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Kelly and Mr. Augustine Lonergan for the appellant in support of the motions, and by Mr. William H. Brooks and Mr. David H. Keedy for the appellees in opposition thereto.

W. J. Foye Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
1150 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill in behalf of counsel for the respondent, leave was granted to file brief of respondent in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari on or before Monday, May 17.

Old Colony Trust Company, as Trustee, Appellant,
194 vs.
The City of Seattle, County of King, et al., etc., et al.

The supplemental motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Miller in behalf of Mr. Howard A. Hanson, and Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy, for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. James B. Howe for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Norman T. Whitaker, Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus, or in the alternative for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel in behalf of the petitioner.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The time within which to present proposed form of decree was extended per stipulation of counsel.

Andrew P. Vought,
Petitioner,
1128 vs.
K. K. Karns, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Andrew P. Vought, Bankrupt.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Bunn for the petitioner.

A. C. MacFarland,
Petitioner,
1130 vs.
W. D. Haden et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Adams and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioner.

The Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
1134 vs.
Winnie G. Dodge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick L. Allen, Mr. Randolph Barton, Jr., and Mr. Forrest Bramble for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred S. Niles for the respondent.

Sandoz Chemical Works,
Petitioner,
1136 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan R. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence for the respondent.

The Simplex Window Company,
Petitioner,
1137 vs.
Fred Hauser, doing Business under the firm name and style of Hauser Window Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Hodges for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lester Wood for the respondent.

T. H. Deal and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company of Baltimore, Petitioners,
1138 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis S. Beedy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Kennedy White for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
1139 vs.
The State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Portland Cement Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. T. Miller, Mr. C. B. Stuart, and Mr. J. W. Sharp, Mr. M. K. Cruce, Mr. Ben Franklin, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
1147 vs.
L. E. McKinley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ashby M. Warren for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas C. Mapother for the respondent.

Wallace Addressing Machine Company, Inc., Petitioner,
1148 vs.
Edwin D. Belknap and Rapid Addressing Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. E. Clarkson Seward for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Owen Edmonds and Mr. A. Parker Smith for the respondent.

Nitro Development Company,
Petitioner,
1149 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. E. B. Dyer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
1151 vs.
The Belton National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark McMahon for the petitioner.

Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Sainte Marie Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1155 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Julius I. Peyser, and Mr. George F. Snyder for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Kennedy White for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1156 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Julius I. Peyser, and Mr. George F. Snyder for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Kennedy White for the respondent.

Thomas K. Ober, Jr., and William C. Willard, Ancillary Receivers of International Note and Mortgage Company, Petitioners,
1162 vs.
Thomas Raeburn White, Receiver of the R. L. Dollings Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, Mr. Maurice Bower Saul, and Mr. Henry A. Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas Raeburn White for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 24 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that DeWitt W. Ostrander, Esquire, of Clintondale, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that George E. Bradbury, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson, It is ordered that Murdock A. Campbell, Esquire, of Northfield, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, It is ordered that John M. Wolverton, Esquire, of Richwood, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that J. Newton Rayzor, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, It is ordered that Charles W. Taylor, Esquire, of Glenwood Springs, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Carl S. Jefferson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, It is ordered that Walter A. Brown, Esquire, of Jasper, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Dayton Moses, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Clarence T.Lowell, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that John M. Eckley, Esquire, of McLeansboro, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude B. Hudspeth, It is ordered that Fred C. Knollenberg, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Driver, It is ordered that Fred C. Dorsey, Esquire, of Harrington, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Henry F. Long, Esquire, of Topsfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Janie Elizabeth Newton, of Gibson, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Daniel W. Sullivan, Esquire, and Eugene Wengert, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Douglas O. Morgan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
264 vs.
Odell Mills, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ira S. Mills, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

715 vs.

United States ex rel. G. Thomas Birkenstock and Gerald Honon, Executors, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs to the respondents; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

726 vs.

Jacob Katz and George Senn.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
727 vs.
Jacob Katz and Herman Feuerstein.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

W. W. Hay,
Plaintiff in error,
292 vs.
The May Department Stores Company and William McCormick.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with direction to remand it to the Circuit Court of St. Louis.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Irene Hand Corrigan and Helen Curtis, Otherwise Known as Mrs. A. L. Curtis,

Appellants,

104 vs.

John J. Buckley.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,

790 vs.

John E. Zerbey and National Surety Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered as follows: A permit bond on Form 738 is not a bond for a penalty forfeitable in its entire amount upon a breach of condition, but is a bond for indemnity securing the payment of the internal revenue taxes, interest, penalties, and liabilities accruing to the United States by reason of the breach.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Ephraim Lederer, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue,

120 vs.

Mary A. McGarvey, Executrix of the Estate of Francis O'Kane.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. The State of Oklahoma and The City of McAlester, Oklahoma. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

205

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States, Appellant, vs. The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company and the West Side Belt Railroad Company. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

864

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company and the West Side Belt Railroad Company,
Appellants,
865 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on cross appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cross-appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Clarence C. Culver,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Appellant,
232 vs.
Richard Mayer, Edwin Reis, Karl B. Strauss et al., etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to the appellant; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Richard Mayer,

Appellant,

233 vs.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, Edwin Reis, Karl B. Strauss, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to the appellant; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Edwin Reis, Karl B. Strauss, and Anny Reis, etc., Appellants,

234 vs.

Richard Mayer and Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Max Henkels,

Appellant,

318 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company, Canal Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Felix E. Gunter, et al., Plaintiffs in error,

244 vs.

Jackson & Eastern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company, Canal Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Felix E. Gunter, et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Jackson & Eastern Railway Company. 244 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Alvin R. Durham Company and Fred S. Larson, Alias Fred M. Larson. 257 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Turner, Dennis & Lowry Lumber Company, Plaintiff in error,
271 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States, Appellant,
282 vs.
Wyckoff Pipe & Creosoting Company, Inc.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and on motion to remand, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Western Paper Makers' Chemical Company and Tanglefoot Company, Appellants,
312 vs.
The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Sperry Gyroscope Company,
Appellant,
239 vs.
Arma Engineering Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the UnitedStates for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General,
Agent U. S. Railroad Administration
(Grand Rapids and Indiana Railroad),
Appellant,
272 vs.
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver of
Rathbone Manufacturing Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as improvidently allowed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General,
Agent U. S. Railroad Administration
(Grand Rapids and Indiana Railroad),
Appellant,
272 vs.
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver of
Rathbone Manufacturing Company.

On writ of certiorari tothe United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed, by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles E. Penner, Alpheus C. Beane, Edmund J. Glenny, et al., Appellants, vs. John A. Boykin and James I. Lowry.

308

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. A. J. Mullens.

163

On writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Wyoming County, State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Wyoming County, State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Wyoming County, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

General Investment Company,
Appellant,
274 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
Annie Nixon, Administratrix of the Estate of Sam Joe Nixon, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Booth Fisheries Company and Zurich
General Accident & Liability Company,
Ltd., Plaintiffs in error, In error to the Supreme Court
313 vs. of the State of Wisconsin.
Industrial Commission of the State of
Wisconsin and Mary McLaughlin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Wisconsin.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the District Court
348 vs. of the United States for the
The Minnesota Mutual Investment District of Colorado.
Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

United States of America,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

FINAL DECREE.

This cause coming on to be heard upon the submission by the parties of a form of decree herein, and for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions of the Court as stated in its opinion herein (March 1, 1926).

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the patents issued by the United States be canceled as to the following described lands patented to the State of Minnesota included within the 706 acres in the Leech Lake, Winnibigoshish and Cass Lake Reservations described in said opinion.

TOWNSHIP 146 N., R. 26 W.

	Acres
Lot 3, Sec. 4	38
Lot 4, Sec. 4	37.60
SW¼ NE¼ Sec. 4	40
SE¼ NW¼ Sec. 4	40
NE¼ SE¼ Sec. 4	40
NW¼ SE¼ Sec. 4	40

TOWNSHIP 142 N., R. 28 W.

SE¼ NE¼ Sec.21	40
SW¼ NW¼ Sec.22	40

TOWNSHIP 147 N., R. 29 W.

Lot 10, Sec. 24	37.10
Lot 11, Sec. 24	43.05
Lot 1, Sec. 25	60.80
	456.55

It appearing to the Court that the State has sold the said lands hereinafter described, it is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the United States have and recover the value of said lands and timber thereon, in the sum of $250.81 as follows:

Lot 2, Sec. 6, T. 143 N., R. 27 W.

43.20 acres at $1.25 with 10 M feet Norway Pine at $4.00 per M ---------- $ 94.00

SE¼ NW¼ Sec. 21, T. 142 N., R. 28 W.

40 acres with 2 M feet white pine at $5.00 per M ------ 60.00

NE¼ NE¼ Sec. 22, T. 142 N., R. 28 W.

40 acres at $1.25 ---------- 50.00

Lot 1, Sec.23, T. 142 N., R. 28 W.

37.45 acres at $1.25 46.81

Total 160.65 acres, of the value of $250.81

It appearing to the Court that no patent was issued to the SE¼ of the NW¼ of Sec. 22, T. 142 N., R. 28 W., containing 40 acres, and to Lot 5 of Sec. 2, T. 141 N., R. 30 W., containing 48.80 acres, the area of 706 acres is reduced accordingly.

As to the remaining 151,418.18 acres described in the complaint, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the bill be, and it is hereby, dismissed.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
1135 vs.
The Holyoke Street Railway Company,
Major Beckman, Melvin Graves, et al.

On consideration of the motion for a temporary restraining order herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
1135 vs.
The Holyoke Street Railway Company,
Major Beckman, Melvin Graves, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: Norman T. Whitaker,
-- Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: Hugh H. Newell,
-- Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile No. 4776501, Alabama License No. 10978, Garth Motor Company, Claimant.
Port Gardner Investment Company,
611 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for Monday, October 4 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew P. Vought,
Petitioner,
1128 vs.
K. K. Kanne, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Andrew P. Vought, Bankrupt.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. H. Deal and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company of Baltimore, Petitioners,
1138 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
1139 vs.
State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Portland Cement Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
1147 vs.
L. E. McKinley.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. C. MacFarland, Petitioner,
1130 vs.
W. D. Haden, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
1134 vs.
Winnie G. Dodge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sandoz Chemical Works,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

1136

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Simplex Window Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Fred Hauser, Doing business under the firm name and style of Hauser Window Company.

1137

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace Addressing Machine Company,
Incorporated, Petitioner,
1148 vs.
Edwin D. Belknap and Rapid Addressing Machine Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nitro Development Company,
Petitioner,
1149 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
1151 vs.
The Belton National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Sainte Marie Railroad Company, New York Central Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

1155 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Michigan Central Railway Company, Vermont Central Railway et al., Petitioners, vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

1156 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas K. Ober, Jr., and William C. Willard, Ancillary Receivers of International Note and Mortgage Company, Petitioners, vs. Thomas Raeburn White, Receiver of the R. L. Dollings Company.

1162 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. H. Brasfield et al., Petitioners,
814 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Cologero Fasulo, Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

The United States of America, Appellant,
843 vs.
International Harvester Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
885 vs.
James W. McElvain et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error.

The Virginian Railway Company, Appellant,
924 vs.
The United States of America et al.
United States of America et al., Appellants,
925 vs.
The Virginian Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States of America, and by Mr. E. W. Knight, Mr. W. H. T. Loyall, and Mr. James W. Carmalt for the Virginian Railway Company, in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, et al., Appellants, 930 vs. The New York Central Railroad Company.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants.
C. A. Hudson et al., Petitioners, 1016 vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.
William Earl Dodge et al., Petitioners, 1132 vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.
Charles H. Spear et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error, 1085 vs. The United States of America.	The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.
In re disbarment of John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, Henry E. Bolt, Walter Holland, and Norman T. Whitaker.	The report of the committee of the Bar was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell.
Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant, 1163 vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. John A. Garver and Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellee.

R. B. Morris, doing business etc., et al., Appellants,
1203 vs.
William Duby et al.

The motion for stay or in the alternative for the advancement of this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. J. M. Dovers for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Ben C. Jones & Company, Plaintiff in error,
927 vs.
The West Publishing Company.

The motion to reinstate this cause to the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the plaintiff in error.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
1163 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
1164 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
1180 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer etc.

The motion for leave to file brief as amici curiae and to file motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer M. Leesman for the cities, villages, and taxing districts in the State of Illinois outside of Cook County.

A. Stanley Copeland,
Plaintiff in error,
No. -- vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for an order requiring the Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to make a return to the writ of error was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Stanley Copeland pro se.

Herman A. Uihlein et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
615 vs.
The State of Wisconsin et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Miller, Mr. Edwin S. Mack, and Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild for the plaintiff in error.

William H. Maxwell and Globe Indemnity Company, Plaintiffs in error,
304 vs.
The United States of America.

Mandate granted on motion of Mr. George A. King for the plaintiff in error.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself and all other seamen, etc., Petitioner,
1012 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in behalf of Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner.

State of Michigan,
Complainant,
27 Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion to consolidate this cause with No. 16 Original, and for leave to file answer on or before June 1, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morton S. Cressy, and Mr. Hector Brouillet for the Sanitary District of Chicago, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz, and Mr. Hugh S. Johnson for the State of Illinois.

State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion for the appointment of a commissioner to take testimony in this cause was submitted to the consideration by Mr. Newton D. Baker in that behalf.

Hartsville Oil Mill,
Appellant,
609 vs.
The United States.

The motion to stay the mandate and to modify the judgment in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don F. Reed, Mr. Christie Benet, Mr. Wade H. Ellis, and Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the appellant.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
1051 vs.
Ynchausti and Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake and Mr. Alexander Britton for the respondent.

J. A. Walker and wife, Elizabeth Walker, Petitioners,
1202 vs.
George C. Hopkins, as Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion for leave to file brief as amici curiae in this cause was granted on motion of Mr. Stiles W. Burr in behalf of Mr. Fred B. Dodge and Mr. A. W. Clapp.

Leslie Albert Porter,
Plaintiff in error,
884 vs.
The City of Lewiston et al.

The motion to reinstate this cause to the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stiles W. Burr in behalf of Mr. Robert B. Leeper for the Plaintiff in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James H. Babb for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Channon-Emery Stove Company,
Petitioner,
913 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Mosler Metal Products Corporation,
Petitioner,
914 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Joseph Henry Cohen for the respondent.

American Seating Company,
Petitioner,
915 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Thaddeus G. Benton for the respondent.

Collier Manufacturing Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, for the respondent.

Ohio Public Service Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George T. Stormont for the respondent.

The Lone Star Brewing Association,
Petitioner,
1111 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend, and Mr. James Craig Peacock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

Charles L. Fuller,
Petitioner,
1141 vs.
Steamship Benclcuch, her engines, etc., George McMillan, and Cunard Steamship Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank I. Finkler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan B. A. Bradley, Mr. Franklin Grady, Mr. Robert S. Erskine, and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

Charles L. Fuller,
Petitioner,
1142 vs.
Steamship Ellerdale, her engines, etc., Edgar Calvert, and the Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank I. Finkler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan B. A. Bradley, Mr. Franklin Grady, Mr. Robert S. Erskine, and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President, etc., Petitioner, vs. Wilbur E. Skinner. 1143

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. E. T. Miller, and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President, etc., Petitioner, vs. Victor H. Wilson. 1144

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. E. T. Miller, and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President, etc., Petitioner, vs. Warren R. Bennison. 1145

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. E. T. Miller, and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President, etc., Petitioner, vs. Peter S. Stoneham. 1146

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. E. T. Miller, and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett for the respondent.

W. J. Foye Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
1150 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew A. Hall and Mr. Raymond G. Young for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent.

L. P. Summers,
Petitioner,
1152 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Elliott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

L. Van Der Stegen, doing business under the firm name and style of The Belgian Trading Company,
Petitioner,
1154 vs.
Neuss, Hesslein & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren Gregory and Mr. Blair S. Shuman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the respondent.

Mary C. March,
Petitioner,
1158 vs.
Vulcan Iron Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis G. Morten for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Townsend, Jr., for the respondent.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom & Cie, Societe Anonyme, Petitioner,
1159 vs.
Gulf Export & Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry G. Gray for the petitioner.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1160 vs.
Wells-Dickey Trust Company, Special Administrator of the Estate of Elmer E. Anderson, Deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. M. Miner for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1161 vs.
Dora Goodman, Administratrix of the Estate of Nathan Goodman, Deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Eggers and Mr. Morison R. Waite for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee Warren James for the respondent.

Ben W. Steele, Executor of the Estate of A. B. Steele, Deceased, Petitioner,
1166 vs.
J. H. Drummond.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Thomson and Mr. Harold Hirsch for the petitioner.

Roscoe D. Rand, Petitioner,
1167 vs.
The National Bank of Newport.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jasper M. Johnson for the petitioner.

M. Kanamack & Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
1168 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Slade for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mueller Grain Company, Petitioner,
1169 vs.
American State Bank of Omaha, Nebraska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Bachrach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carl Meyer, Mr. Henry Russell Platt, and Mr. David F. Rosenthal for the respondent.

Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
1173 vs.
The City of Manila.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. H. Hedrick and Mr. O. R. McGuire for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. L. H. Cake for the respondent.

Olive S. McGrew, Petitioner,
1174 vs.
John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner.

Neufield T. Jones and Winfield Jones,
Petitioners,
1175 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company,
Petitioner,
1176 vs.
Louise Doran.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eugene Mackey for the respondent.

Milos Vojnovic,
Petitioner,
1177 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carol Weiss King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago Title and Trust Company, as Receiver of the La Salle Street Trust and Savings Bank,
Petitioner,
1181 vs.
Frank G. Gardner, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the O'Gara Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram T. Gilbert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Wolf, Mr. Alex. F. Reichmann, and Mr. Arthur M. Cox for the respondent.

Great Southern Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1182 vs.
S. L. Burwell, Administrator of the Estate of John Emmet Cunningham, Deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde A. Sweeton, Mr. William A. Vinson, and Mr. R. H. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Watkins for the respondent.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1183 vs.
New York and Albany Lighterage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Winifred Sullivan for the respondent.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1184 vs.
Lloyd W. Seaman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bern Budd for the respondent.

Frank K. Bowers, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1185 vs.
Thomas Staples Fuller.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas S. Fuller for the respondent.

O. K. Kines, Fred Rasmussen and G. L. Strick, Trustees for the Pennsylvania Milk Products Company, Petitioners,
1186 vs.
A. H. Lamborn, H. B. Hutchings, G. H. Logan, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leavitt J. Hunt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren for the respondents.

Edward B. Strom, Petitioner,
1189 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Myron H. Walker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Societe de Navigation a Vapeur France Indo-Chine, Petitioner,
1225 vs.
Cooper & Cooper, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. William J. Dean for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the respondent.

Societe de Navigation a Vapeur France Indo-Chine, Petitioner,
1226 vs.
Harrisons & Crossfield, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. William J. Dean for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, June 1, at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that James I. Phelps, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin S. Grosscup, It is ordered that Overton G. Ellis, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, It is ordered that Aubrey M. Pyburn, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Cummins, It is ordered that Glenn McHugh, Esquire, and Ellsworth C. Alvord, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert A. Jones, It is ordered that Samuel Leavitt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew H. O'Brien, It is ordered that Clarence Milton Updegraff, Esquire, of Iowa City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Philbrick McCoy, Esquire, of Silver Spring, State of Maryland, and Paul Koch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morton S. Cressy, It is ordered that Gustaf B. A. Erickson, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce L. Casteel, It is ordered that Frank B. Meseke, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

City of Douglas,

Plaintiff in error,

279 vs.

Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Ed. Raffel,
307 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Ma-King Products Company,
Appellant,
333 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

S. H. Davis, J. A. White, and Annie White, Plaintiffs in error, 316 vs. Alice Williford, Allie Griffin, Rosie Williford et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

S. H. Davis, J. A. White, and Annie White, Plaintiffs in error, 316 vs. Alice Williford, Allie Griffin, Rosie Williford et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

S. H. Davis, J. A. White, and Annie White, Plaintiffs in error, 316 vs. Alice Williford, Allie Griffin, Rosie Williford et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner, 268 vs. Edith F. Coogan, as Special Administratrix of the Estate of William Coogan, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
1061 vs.
John Ramsey and William K. Hale.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

In the matter of the Application of William Buder and others,
No. -- Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al.,
265 vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered as follows:

Question I, if interpreted strictly and according to the ordinary meaning of the words employed, must be answered in the negative. We assume that to "give precedence" implies recognition of superior importance. As above stated, to the extent of their debts creditors are entitled to priority over stockholders against all the property of an insolvent corporation. But it does not follow that in every reorganization the securities offered to general creditors must be superior in rank or grade to any which stockholders may obtain. It is not impossible to accord to the creditor his superior rights in other ways. Generally, additional funds will be essential to the success of the undertaking, and it may be impossible to obtain them unless stockholders are permitted to contribute and retain an interest sufficiently valuable to move them. In such or similar cases the chancellor may exercise an informed discretion concerning the practical adjustment of the several rights.

Question II is answered in the affirmative, with the qualifications which follow. The primary right of unsecured creditors to the assets of an insolvent corporation remaining after lienholders are satisfied, must be adequately protected; and to each one of them there must be given such opportunity as the circumstances permit to secure the full enjoyment of this preference.

Question III is also answered in the affirmative, subject to the following qualification. No offer is fair which does not recognize the prior rights of creditors, as above pointed out; but circumstances may justify an offer of different amounts of the same grade of securities to both creditors and stockholders. Whenever assessments are demanded, they must be adjusted with the purpose of according to the creditor his full right of priority against the corporate assets, so far as possible in the existing circumstances.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Home Furniture Company, George H. Park, and James P. Kilcrease, etc., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, The Southern Pacific Company et al.

324 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Old Colony Trust Company, as Trustee, Appellant, vs. The City of Seattle, County of King, W. W. Shields, as Treasurer etc., et al.

194 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, vs. Jose Candelaria et al.

208 — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered as follows:

To the first question, we answer that the United States is not barred. But, as it appears that for many years the United States has employed and paid a special attorney to represent the Pueblo Indians and look after their interests, our answer is made with the qualification that, if the decree was rendered in a suit begun and prosecuted by the special attorney so employed and paid, we think the United States is as effectually concluded as if it were a party to the suit.

Answering the second question, we eliminate so much of it as refers to a possible disregard of a survey made by the United States, for that would have no bearing on the court's jurisdiction or the binding effect of the judgment or decree, but would present only a question of whether error was committed in the course of exercising jurisdiction. With that eliminated, our answer to the question is that the state court had jurisdiction to entertain the suit and proceed to judgment or decree. Whether the outcome would be conclusive on the United States is sufficiently shown by our answer to the first question.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edgar S. Appleby and John S. Appleby, Individually and as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Charles E. Appleby, Deceased, Plaintiffs in error, vs. The City of New York, Eben E. Olcott, Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

15

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Edgar S. Appleby and John S. Appleby, Plaintiffs in error, vs. John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of Docks of the City of New York. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

16

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Oscar Thornton, Shabie Thornton, Inman Thornton, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

255

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

D. H. Brasfield et al., Petitioners,
814 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cologero Pasulo, Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
843 vs.
International Harvester Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
885 vs.
James W. McElvain et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the

The Virginian Railway Company,
Appellant,
924 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
925 vs.
The Virginian Railway Company.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
930 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Hudson et al.,
Petitioners,
1016 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Earl Dodge et al.,
Petitioners,
1132 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Ottinger, Attorney General, etc., Appellant,
1163 vs.
The Consolidated Gas Company.
Albert Ottinger, Attorney General, etc., Appellant,
1164 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.
Albert Ottinger, Attorney General, etc., Appellant,
1180 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Uihlein et al., Plaintiffs in error,
615 vs.
The State of Wisconsin et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius Anderson, etc., Petitioner,
1012 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
1051 vs.
Ynchausti & Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, andthe same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. B. Morris, doing business etc., Appellants,
1205 vs.
William Duby et al.,

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein, or in the alternative for the advancement of the cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion for stay be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the said motion to advance be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben C. Jones & Company, Plaintiff in error,
927 vs.
The West Publishing Company.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause to the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae and to present a motion to dismiss,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Stanley Copeland,
No. -- vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion for an order directing a return to a writ or error herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartsville Oil Mill, Appellant,
609 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to stay the mandate herein and to modify the judgment.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Leslie Albert Porter,
Plaintiff in error,
884 vs.
The City of Lewiston et al.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause to the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity National Bank & Trust Company of Kansas City, et al.,
Appellants,
294 vs.
Felix H. Swope et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for a reargument and assigned for Monday, October 4 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The report of the committee of the Bar in re Disbarment of John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, Henry E. Bolt, Walter Holland, and Norman T. Whitaker. The report of the Committee of the Bar is received and filed, and the thanks of the court are expressed to the committee for its very satisfactory report.

The following order, as recommended by the committee, is hereby made and directed to be entered, viz:

ORDER.

The committee of the bar of this court, appointed by order of this Court January 18, 1926, to consider the charges heretofore filed against the members of the bar of this court named herein, having filed its report and recommendations respecting the action to be taken herein, and the court having duly considered the report of the committee and the other files, records, and proceedings in this matter, and it appearing that the members of the bar of this court named herein have been disbarred by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and that they do not possess the qualifications entitling them to continue as members of the bar of this court, it is ordered that the said Norman T. Whitaker, John H. Adriaans, Horace L. B. Atkisson, L. Grandin Grossman, and Henry E. Bolt be, and each of them hereby is, disbarred and that their names be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this court.

It appearing that a suit is now pending in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to which the said Walter Holland is a party, and which he contends may lead to his reinstatement as a member of the Bar of that court, It is ordered that the said Walter Holland be suspended from practice before this court until such time as he shall file with this court certificates from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia showing that he has been reinstated as a member of the bars of those courts. It is further ordered that unless such certificates are filed with the clerk of this court on or before December 31, 1926, the said Walter Holland be then disbarred without further notice and his name stricken from the roll of attorneys and counsellors admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President, etc., Petitioner,
1143 vs.
Wilbur E. Skinner.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President, etc., Petitioner,
1144 vs.
Victor H. Wilson.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President, etc., Petitioner,
1145 vs.
Warren R. Bennison.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President, etc., Petitioner,
1146 vs.
Peter S. Stoneham.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted.
And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom & Cie., Societe Anonyme, Petitioner,
1159 vs.
Gulf Export & Transportation Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted.
and it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1160 vs.
Wells-Dickey Trust Company, Special Administrator of the Estate of Elmer E. Anderson, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1161 vs.
Dora Goodman, Administratrix of the Estate of Nathan Goodman, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben W. Steele, Executor of the Estate of A. B. Steele, Deceased, Petitioner,
1166 vs.
J. H. Drummond.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mueller Grain Company, Petitioner,
1169 vs.
American State Bank of Omaha, Nebraska.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue, Ben F. Wright, as Insular Auditor, Vincente Carmona, etc., et al., Petitioners,
1173 vs.
The City of Manila.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1183 vs.
New York & Albany Lighterage Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1184 vs.
Lloyd W. Seaman.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
1185 vs.
Thomas Staples Fuller.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Channon-Emery Stove Company, Petitioner,
913 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mosler Metal Products Corporation, Petitioner,
914 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Seating Company, Petitioner,
915 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Collier Manufacturing Company, Inc., Petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ohio Public Service Company, Petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lone Star Brewing Association, Petitioner,
1111 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Fuller,

Petitioner,

1141 vs.

Steamship "Benclench" her engines, etc., George McMillan, and Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Fuller,

Petitioner,

1142 vs.

Steamship "Ellerdale", her engines, etc., Edgar Calvert, and The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. J. Foye Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

1150 vs.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. P. Summers,

Petitioner,

1152 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. Van Der Stegen, doing business under the firm name and style of The Belgian Trading Company,

Petitioner,

1154 vs.

Neuss, Hesslein & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary C. March,

Petitioner,

1158 vs.

Vulcan Iron Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roscoe H. Rand,

Petitioner,

1167 vs.

The National Bank of Newport.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Kanansack & Company, Inc., Meyer Kananack and Irving Kanansack, Petitioners,

1168 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Olive S. McGrew,

Petitioner,

1174 vs.

John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Neufield T. Jones and Winfield Jones,
Petitioners,
1175 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company,
Petitioner,
1176 vs.
Louise Doran.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milos Vojnovic,
Petitioner,
1177 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Title and Trust Company, as Receiver of the La Salle Street Trust and Savings Bank, Petitioner,
1181 vs.
Frank G. Gardner, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the O'Gara Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Southern Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1182 vs.
S. L. Burwell, Administrator of the Estate of John Emmet Cunningham, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. K. Kines, Fred Rasmussen and G. L. Strick, Trustees for the Pennsylvania Milk Products Company, Petitioners,
1186 vs.
A. H. Lamborn, H. B. Hutchings, G. H. Logan, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward B. Strom,
Petitioner,
1189 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Societe de Navigation a Vapeur France Indo-Chine, Petitioner,
1225 vs.
Cooper & Cooper, Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Societe de Navigation a Vapeur France Indo-Chine, Petitioner,
1226 vs.
Harrisons & Crossfield, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

ORDER.

To expedite the hearing of criminal cases upon the docket of this court, brought here by writ of error directly from State courts or from those courts by appeals from writs of habeas corpus in Federal courts, It is ordered that all cases of this kind upon the docket be advanced for hearing and set during the October sessions of this Court at the October, 1926, term.

It is further ordered that appeals in Federal criminal cases arising under the laws of the United States and now upon the docket of this court, be also advanced for hearing at the October sessions for the October Term of 1926.

It is further ordered that all the cases heretofore advanced and set for hearing on October 4 next shall be reassigned for special dates during the October sessions of 1926.

The clerk is directed to assign these three classes of cases for the four weeks of October sessions, beginning on the 4th of October and ending on Friday, the 29th of October, to spread the assignments upon the Journal, and to notify counsel of the dates of the special settings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wade Johnson,
Plaintiff in error,
578 vs.
The State of Georgia.
Jarrett Benford,
Plaintiff in error,
579 vs.
The State of Georgia.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ned Harvey,
Plaintiff in error,
825 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. George C. Bryant,
Plaintiff in error,
1101 vs.
Charles F. Zimmermann, Chief of Police, et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

August Dorchy,
Plaintiff in error,
491 vs.
The State of Kansas.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Nelson,
Plaintiff in error.
550 vs.
The People of the State of California.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,
Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry L. Conn, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.
Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
938 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.
Clark Motor Company, Appellant,
937 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner etc.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next, as one case.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
903 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.
Utterbach-Gleason Company,
Appellant,
904 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner etc.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al.,
Petitioners,
741 vs.
Attleboro Steam & Electric Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, and Harry W. Stein, Inspector of Buildings for the Village of Euclid,
Appellants,
179 vs.
Ambler Realty Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for reargument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg, et al., Petitioner,
764 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
635 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday,

Doras Hebert et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
145 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reba Fenwick,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting Attorney, Darke County, Ohio.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Massachusetts State Grange; The Inhabitants of the Town of Hadley, Massachusetts, et al.,
Appellants,
967 vs.
Jay R. Benton, as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
464 vs.
General Electric Company, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company and Westinghouse Lamp Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. H. Brasfield et al.,
Petitioners,
814 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cologero Pasulo,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold H. Brein,
Plaintiff in error,
840 vs.
State Department of Health et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Petroleum Company,
Plaintiff in error,
624 vs.
County of Kern.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
626 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
1163 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.
Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
1164 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.
Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
1180 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, as one case, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile, No. 4776501, Alabama License No. 10978, Garth Motor Company, Claimant.
Port Gardner Investment Company,
611 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore restored to the docket and assigned for reargument on October 4 next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for reargument on Monday, October 18 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Goldman,
Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stella Van Oster,
Plaintiff in error,
993 vs.
The State of Kansas.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,
Appellant,
386 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
801 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Graves,
Plaintiff in error,
1067 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
885 vs.
James W. McElvain et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Hudson, et al.,
Petitioners,
1016 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. Hose, Plaintiff in error,
374 vs.
U. S. Webb, Attorney General of the State of California et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 18 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
410 vs.
Western Meat Company.
Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.
Swift & Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next, as one case.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
843 vs.
International Harvester
Company et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Ford, George Harris, J.
Evelyn, et al., Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Giovanni Di Santo,
Plaintiff in error,
949 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Earl Dodge et al.,
Petitioners,
1132 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Uihlein et al.,
Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The State of Wisconsin et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
1135 vs.
The Holyoke Street Railway Company
et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the
Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
1051 vs.
Ynchausti & Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius Anderson, etc.,
Petitioner,
1012 vs.
Shipowners Association of the
Pacific Coast et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leslie A. Gilmore,
Plaintiff in error,
518 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. B. Morris, Doing Business as
Morris & Lowther, et al.,
Appellants,
1203 vs.
William Duby, H. B. Van Duzer
and W. H. Malone, etc.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
930 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company, Appellant,
924 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
925 vs.
The Virginian Railway Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore assigned for October 4 next, on the Summary Docket, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 25 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. A. Edenfield, Petitioner,
909 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
1258 vs.
Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants.

Norman S. Bowles, Appellant,
554 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee in support of the motion.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
603 vs.
Benjamin Brauer, Harry Cantor,
Leopold Brauer, et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Remus,
Petitioner,
1257 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf leave was granted to file brief for the respondent in this cause on Wednesday, June 2.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. Edward E. Browne in that behalf, a stipulation to extend time was submitted and the time within which to present final decree was extended.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
1032 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
1033 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien in behalf of Mr. Herman L. Ekern and Mr. R. M. Reiser for the defendant in error.

State of Michigan,
Complainant,
27 Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Morton S. Cressy in that behalf, leave was granted to file joint and several answers of defendants.

State of Michigan,
Complainant,
27 Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion to consolidate this case with No. 16 Original was resubmitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morton S. Cressy in that behalf.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Morton S. Cressy in that behalf, leave was granted to file answer of the State of Illinois.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
3 Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Charles Warren, the Special Master appointed herein, the report of the Special Master was presented and ordered filed.

John Lapique, assignee of the Estate of Miguel Leonis et al.,
Petitioners,
No. -- vs.
The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California et al.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus and the motion for a writ of error was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Lapique, pro se.

L. Anthony et al., etc., et al.,
Appellants,
1047 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State.

I. S. Martine et al.,
Appellants,
1204 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants.

Walter Nelson et al., etc., et al., Appellants,
1260 vs.
W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.
W. S. Cunningham et al., Appellants,
1261 vs.
W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the appellants.

L. A. Nixon, Plaintiff in error,
480 vs.
C. C. Herndon and Charles Porras.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Cobb for the plaintiff in error.

The State of Florida, Complainant,
No. -- Original. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Johnson for the complainant.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The proposed form of decree in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence T. Moser for the defendants, with leave to the complainant to file brief and affidavits in opposition thereto on or before Thursday next, on motion of Mr. Edwin H. Abbot in that behalf.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Appellant,
786 vs.
L. Mundet & Sons, Inc.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otis Beall Kent in behalf of Mr. John A. McManus for the appellee in support of the motion, with leave to appellant to file opposition thereto on or before Friday next, on motion of Mr. Robert Ash in behalf

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company, Plaintiff in error,
No. -- vs.
Marian L. Robinson, as Administratrix of George Robinson, Deceased.

The return to the rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Koch for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the defendant in error.

United States Sugar Equalization Board, Inc., Petitioner,
800 vs.
P. De Bonde & Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the writ of certiorari, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry L. Robertson, Plaintiff in error,
1027 vs.
John M. Fannin, Mrs. John M. Fannin, and Robert M. Fannin.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe H. Tiger, Plaintiff in error,
497 vs.
William M. Powell, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William O. Beall for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Simon Platt, Receiver for Manufacturers' Union, Petitioner,
1096 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fulton Brylawski and Mr. Nathan Clayton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. John Henry Cohen for the respondent.

Frank Bornn, trading as the Bornn Distilling Company, Petitioner,
1099 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

William Walter Owen, Petitioner,
1172 vs.
George Heimann.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. Scott and Mr. H. McClure Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward H. Clement for the respondent.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi, Petitioner,
1179 vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander W. Smith, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph, Mr. Robert S. Parker, Mr. Newton D. Baker, and Mr. M. B. Angell for the respondents.

E. O. Jones, as Trustee,
Petitioner,
1187 vs.
J. B. Adams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin P. Crum for the petitioner.

Estelle L. Mattice,
Petitioner,
1188 vs.
Nathan H. Klawans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Corinne L. Rice for the petitioner, and by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the respondent.

Otto H. Reinke, Mette Reinke, Mary Reinke, et al.,
Petitioners,
1190 vs.
J. B. Hire, as Administrator of the Estate of Julius Quandt, Deceased, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioners.

Louis Brenner, Samuel Brenner, Benjamin Brenner, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1191 vs.
Arthur H. Lamborn, Henry B. Hutchings, George H. Logan, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leavitt J. Hunt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren for the respondents.

Matthew Smith, Tea, Coffee & Grocery Company, Petitioner,
1192 vs.
A. H. Lamborn, H. B. Hutchings, G. H. Logan, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leavitt J. Hunt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren for the respondents.

T. A. Helm,
Petitioner,
1193 vs.
United Central Oil Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick and Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioner.

Henry B. Hovland,
Petitioner,
1194 vs.
Hoval A. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Potter and Mr. John H. Brickenstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Ross for the respondent.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
1195 vs.
R. E. Kilzey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson and Mr. C. H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. R. Jones for the respondent.

H. N. Smith, E. Olsen, F. Osterman, et al., Petitioners,
1196 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

E. W. Gallaher,
Petitioner,
1197 vs.
The Huntington Engineering Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Wallace for the petitioner.

Kinney-Coastal Oil Company et al., Petitioners,
1198 vs.
Michael P. Kieffer et al., etc., etal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul P. Prosser and Mr. Edward M. Freeman for the petitioners.

Bessie M. Mack, Petitioner,
1200 vs.
Connecticut General Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Bacon and Mr. James J. ODonohue for the petitioner.

Paul Dawson and Delia Dawson, Petitioners,
1201 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Healy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

J. A. Walker and wife, Elizabeth Walker, Petitioners,
1202 vs.
George C. Hopkins, as Collector of Internal Revenue.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Wayman for the petitioners.

David Belais, Inc., Petitioner,
1205 vs.
Goldsmith Bros. Smelting & Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes and Mr. Alan D. Kenyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

William S. Kreiner,
Petitioner,
1207 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence V. Opper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mercantile Bank of the Americas, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1209 vs.
Flower Lighterage Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin A. Schenck and Mr. I. Maurice Wormser for the respondents.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1210 vs.
A. L. Jeffcoat.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Kay for the petitioner, and by Mr. James J. Mayfield for the respondent.

Charles Land,
Petitioner,
1211 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

M. B. Davis, alias Mood Davis,
Petitioner,
1212 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip D. Beall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Isadore Koslinsky,
Petitioner,
1214 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Strong, Mr. Frank J. Looney, and Mr. Rush L. Holland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Charles West,
Petitioner,
1217 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Keech, Jr., Mr. George W. Morgan, Mr. Stanton C. Peele, Mr. C. P. R. Ogilby, Mr. Charles West, and Mr. Everett Petry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchel, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. P. G. Michener for the respondent.

Franklin E. Kerr,
Petitioner,
1223 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Fenton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John Lapique, Assignee of the Estate of Miguel Leonis, et al.,
Petitioner,
1224 vs.
The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Lapique the petitioner, pro se.

George Remus,
Petitioner,
1257 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard Garver, Jr., for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 7 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Browne, It is ordered that Philip M. Clark, Esquire, Newtonville, State of Massachusetts; J. Henry Bennett, Esquire, of Viroqua, State of Wisconsin, and Alexander E. Frederick, Esquire, of Sparta, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, It is ordered that George W. Glaze, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Sewall W. Abbott, Esquire of Wolfeboro, State of New Hampshire, and Abraham Solomon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Leon Robbin, Esquire, and Earle B. Wood, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton Smith, It is ordered that Neal A. Donahue, Esquire, of Auburn, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Jose Escaler, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that Perry A. Sletteland, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin; Josiah T. Walker, Esquire, of Terre Haute, State of Indiana; Wallace C. Magathan, Esquire, and Walter A. Bolinger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel G. Bratton, It is ordered that Renzo D. Bowers, Esquire, of Hagerstown, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Fred. C. Erb, Esquire, of Lewiston, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that S. Homer Ferguson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that Mark Hanna Adams, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Warren Fay Wattles, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. A. E. Graepner, It is ordered that Edmond Wendell Hebel, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence A. Miller, It is ordered that Clarence A. Linn, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Glen R. Metsker, Esquire, of St. Helens, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Perry J. Backus, Esquire, and Richard Todd Archer, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Driver, It is ordered that William F. Laukaitis, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that Elias A. Wright, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Davidson, It is ordered that Sheldon H. Graves, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, It is ordered that Paul Reilly, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that Edgar L. Maxwell, Esquire, of Mountain View, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Peter Baumer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that George E. Kennedy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Richard K. Stevens, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that John R. Layng, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Arnold, It is ordered that Patrick J. McMahon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Swindler, It is ordered that Thomas B. Parker, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, and Harold Van Riper, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Loeb, It is ordered that Nathan Probst, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Brown, It is ordered that Harrison B. McCawley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Bayard, It is ordered the Henry De Forest Baldwin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. McCann, It is ordered that William Baird King, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Bride, It is ordered that James E. Shelton, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dorothy Scott,

Plaintiff in error,

253 vs.

J. A. Paisley, Mrs. Fannie Paisley, Claud Brackett, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Jaybird Mining Company,

Plaintiff in error,

293 vs.

Joe Weir, as County Treasurer of Ottawa County, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Jaybird Mining Company,

Plaintiff in error,

293 vs.

Joe Weir, as County Treasurer of Ottawa County, Oklahoma.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting;
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles Hammer,

Petitioner,

317 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 2, Original.—October Term, 1925.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Tennessee.

DECREE.

[June 7, 1926.]

Announced by Mr. Justice Butler.

The Court overrules the exceptions of the State of Tennessee to the report of the Boundary Commissioners, C. B. Bailey, Charles A. Barton, and Horace Van Deventer, appointed by interlocutory decree of June 10th, 1918, to run, locate and designate the boundary line between the States of Arkansas and Tennessee along that portion of the Mississippi River affected by the Centennial Cut-Off. The boundary line as established by the Commission is accepted, directed and established by the Court in conformity with the Report of the Boundary Commission, as follows:

"Beginning at the mouth of Old River at..... Station 1

Thence S. 73 W. 3,400′ to	Station	1
Thence west 1,000′ to	"	2
Thence N. 80 W. 1,400′ to	"	3
Thence west 2,000′ to	"	4
Thence S. 80 W. 1,200′ to	"	5
	"	6

From station 6 U. S. B. M. Thresher bears S 74-08 W. 1.195

Thence from Station 6

N. 58 W. 2,500′ to	Station	7
N 47 W. 2,500′ to	"	8
N. 13 W. 1.200 to	"	9
N. 16 east 9,200 to	"	10
N. 1 E. 3.015 to	"	11
N. 20-20 E. 1,400′ to	"	12
N. 35-20 E. 5,000′ to	"	13
N. 60 E. 8,000′ to	"	14

From Station 14 Levee Mile Post 121-122 bears N. 60-55 W. 861'.

Thence from Station 14

N. 56-30 E. 900' to	Station	15
N. 18-15 E. 7,100' to	"	16
N. 22-45 E. 1,000' to	"	17
N. 29-45 E. 1,200' to	"	18
N. 40-45 E. 1,400' to	"	19
N. 47-45 E. 1,500' to	"	20
N. 57-45 E. 1,800' to	"	21
N. 72-45 E. 1,800' to	"	22
N. 89-06 E. 3,900' to	"	23

From Station 23 Levee Mile Post 117-118 bears N. 57-05 W. 1,541'.

Thence from Station 23

S. 76-30 E. 2,785' to	Station	24
S. 41-26 E. 4,751' to	"	25
S. 19-26 E. 881' to	"	26
South 1,430' to	"	27
S. 17 W. 4,000' to	"	28

From Station 28 the monument at the N. E. corner of the John Trigg 100-acre tract bears N. 78-30 W. 900 feet.

Thence from Station 28

S. 12 W. 4,000' to	Station	29
South 2,000' to	"	30
S. 15 E. 4,000' to	"	31
S. 40 E. 4,000' to	"	32 "A"
S. 45 W. 3,400' to	"	33 "A"

On the right bank of the Mississippi River.

Beginning on the left bank of the Mississippi River at Station 1 thence S. 5 E. 1,270', from which point U. S. B. M. 57-1 bears S. 60-07 E. 2,606 feet; thence continue on original line S. 5 E. 1,509' to Station 2.

S. 15 W. 3,000 to	Station	3
S. 37 W. 2,500 to	"	4
S. 42 W. 4,000 to	"	5

S. 37 W. 5,000 to..... Station 6
S 32 W. 3,900 to..... " 7
S. 25-30 W. 1,000 to..... " 8

On the left bank of the river.

A total length of boundary line of 116,641 feet, or 22.09 miles."

The foregoing is here and now made the boundary line between the two States parties hereto and the same shall be treated and fixed as the boundary line in question and the same shall be marked accordingy.

The costs certified by the Commissioners are approved and will accordingly be paid.

All costs, including the costs of printing the Report of the Commissioners, with maps filed with said Report to be determined by the Clerk and the compensation to the Commissioners to be fixed by the Court, shall be paid equally by the parties hereto—that is, each shall pay one-half, except the cost of printing the evidence and Supplemental Report of the Commissioners and exhibits, which will be paid by Tennessee.

It is so finally ordered, adjudged, and decreed by the Court.

Marion L. Frost and Wesley H. Frost, co-partners, doing business under the name and style of Frost & Frost Trucking Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Railroad Commission of the State of California.

828

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.

280

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines, Oliver Iron Mining Company, Northern Development Company et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord, J. G. Armson, and Odin Halden, constituting the Minnesota Tax Commission, et al., etc.

336

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

George L. Burrows, Jr., Alice B. Beaumont, Elizabeth B. Huntington, et al., etc., et al., Appellants,
355 vs.
Samuel Lord, James G. Armson, Odin Halden, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Royal Mineral Association, North Range Iron Company, Myers Brothers Company et al., Appellants,
388 vs.
Samuel Lord, J. G. Armson, and Odin Halden, Constituting the Minnesota Tax Commission et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William E. Boeing, Caroline Boeing Poole, Morton D. Hull, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord, J. G. Armson, and Odin Halden, Constituting the Minnesota Tax Commission et al.

389 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Robert E. Whiteside, W. J. Conan, Eliza Conan et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord, J. G. Armson, and Odin Halden, Constituting the Minnesota Tax Commission, et al.

390 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Merrimac Mining Company, Appellant, vs. Samuel Lord, J. G. Armson, and Odin Halden, Constituting the Minnesota Tax Commission.

391 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Helen P. Bardwell, Harriot P. Ayer, and Alice P. Forsman,
Appellants,
471 vs.
Sargent Land Company, Samuel Lord, James G. Armson, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Panama Rail Road Company,
Petitioner,
260 vs.
Agapito Vasquez, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits which were of Maximiliano Sanchez, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Berizzi Brothers Company,

Appellant,

334 vs.

The Steamship "Pesaro", her engines, boilers, etc., and Don Celasio Caetani, Royal Italian Ambassador.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,

Petitioner,

326 vs.

Steamship "Northern Star", her engines, etc., and Harry Luber.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Yu Cong Eng and Co Liam, for themselves and for the benefit of other persons similarly situated and affected, Petitioners,

623 vs.

W. Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue; Enlogio P. Revilla, as Fiscal for the City of Manila et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jose Alejandrino,

Petitioner,

309 vs.

Manuel L. Quezon, Isabelo de los Reyes, Santiago Fonacier, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with directions to dismiss the petition without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward P. Coltra, Petitioner,

718 vs.

Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States; Col. T. Q. Ashburn, Chief Inland & Coastwise Waterways Service, etc., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, vs. John Ramsey and William K. Hale. 1061

The motion for mandate in this cause is granted, and it is ordered that the mandate issue forthwith.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. William F. Brims, et al. 719

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. A. Edenfield, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 909

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 4 next, on the Summary Docket.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company. 1258

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3, 1927.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
1032 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
1033 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument with case No. 386, on Monday, October 18 next, as one case.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

L. Anthony et al.,
Appellants,
1047 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State.

I. S. Martine, et al.,
Appellants,
1204 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State of Oregon.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 3, 1927, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Walter Nelson, et al.,
Appellants,
1260 vs.
W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

W. S. Cunningham et al.,
Appellants,
1261 vs.
W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 3, 1927, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

L. A. Nixon,

Plaintiff in error,

480 vs.

C. C. Herndon et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3, 1927, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Michigan,

Complainant,

27 Original. vs.

The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file answers in this cause, and the motion to consolidate this cause with case No. 16 Original, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion for leave to file answers herein be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the motion to consolidate this cause with case No. 16 Original, be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Norman S. Bowles,

Appellant,

554 vs.

W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as moot, and the order denying the writ of habeas corpus be, and the same is hereby, vacated, and the cause remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the petition.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John Lapique,
-- Original. vs.
The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for a writ of error in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Original. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file bill of complaint in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that a rule issue upon the defendants, returnable on Monday, October 4 next, to show cause why leave to file the bill of complaint should not be granted.
Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Appellant,
786 vs.
L. Mundet & Sons, Incorporated.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Plaintiff in error,
No. ---. vs.
Marion L. Robinson, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of George Robinson, Deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause having been heard on the return to the rule to show cause, why the writ of error heretofore allowed should not be dismissed,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Joe H. Tiger,

Plaintiff in error,

497 vs.

William M. Fewell, Edwin J. Peebles, and J. W. Burgess.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

3 Original. vs.

The State of Texas.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the report of the special master in this cause be, and it is hereby, received, and a hearing on the report and any exceptions thereto is set for Monday, January, 3, 1927.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 14, Original.—October Term, 1925.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
vs.
State of New York, et al., Defendants } In Equity.

DECREE.

[June 7, 1926.]

This cause coming on to be heard on the bill of complaint, the answers of the several defendants, and upon the pleadings and proofs as well as upon the report of Wade H. Ellis, Esquire, the Special Master appointed by this Court to take proofs and make report to this Court in this cause, and the arguments of counsel thereupon had; therefore for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions of this Court as stated in its opinion filed herein April 12, 1926,

It is now here Ordered, Adjudged, and Decreed, by this Court, *First:* That in and by the agreement duly entered into between the Commissioners of the State of New York and the Commissioners of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relating to the so-called western lands and dated December 16th, 1786, which Agreement is called in this case and generally known as the Treaty of Hartford and which is recorded in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Volume 1, Treaties and Contracts, page 83 and is also duly recorded in the Office of the Secretary of State of the State of New York, in Liber 22 of Deeds at page 3e, which Treaty of Hartford is referred to in said Bill of Complaint and in the said Answers thereto, the State of New York did not cede nor grant unto the Commonwealth of Massachusetts any of the land then under the water of Lake Ontario, and that the right of preemption of lands and territory granted to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the State of New York was not intended by the State of New York nor by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to include any of the bed of Lake Ontario as it

then existed, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and by the terms in said Treaty did thereby cede and release to the State of New York all right and title of said Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and to the bed of Lake Ontario as part of the rights appertaining to the sovereignty of the State of New York over the said territory.

Second: That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and by its Legislative Act approved November 21st, 1788 in Chapter 23 of the Laws and Resolutions of the Session of 1788-1789, did duly grant and convey to Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorham the lands and premises which are known in this case and generally known as the Phelps and Gorham purchase, bounded by the north boundary line of the State of Pennsylvania, bounded on the east by the meridian line which formed the easterly boundary line of the land, the right of preemption to which was ceded to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the Treaty of Hartford; bounded on the west by a line which it was agreed and enacted as it approaches Lake Ontario running northwardly should be "12 miles distant from the most westward bounds of said Genesee River to the shore of Ontario Lake" and the north boundary of which, it was so agreed and enacted should run thence easterly along the shores of said Lake to the meridian forming said easterly boundary, and that it was the intention of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of said Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorham; that in and by the said grant, there should be vested in said Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorham title in and to all of the land between the northern boundary of Pennsylvania and the waters of Lake Ontario between the eastern and the western boundary lines of said grant, and that the expression used in said Legislative Act and grant "to the shore of Lake Ontario, thence eastwardly along the shores of said lake," was intended by the parties in said grant to mean to the edge of the water of Lake Ontario, and thence eastwardly along the water line of Lake Ontario, and that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts did not intend to and did not retain unto itself any land lying within said eastern and western boundaries of said Phelps and Gorham purchase bordering on waters of Lake Ontario and called the shore thereof, and that the Plaintiff, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has no right, title and interest in or to any of the real estate or premises described in the Bill of Complaint.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the Bill of Complaint herein be, and the same hereby is, dismissed with costs to be paid by the Complainant.

It is further ordered by this Court that there be included as costs in this Court one-half of the cost of the typewritten copy of the testimony furnished to the Special Master, and the whole of the clerk's costs in this Court.

It is further ordered by this Court that there shall be paid by the Complainant to Wade H. Ellis, Esquire, Special Master appointed herein, the sum of Four Thousand Dollars ($4,000.00) as compensation for his services as such Special Master, together with the additional sum of Eight Hundred and Twenty-four Dollars and Twenty-eight Cents ($824.28), disbursements necessarily incurred by him as such Special Master.

The State of Wisconsin et al.,

Complainants,

16 Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, and The Sanitary District of Chicago, The State of Missouri et al.,

Intervening Defendants.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that this cause be referred to Charles Evans Hughes, Esquire, as a special master with directions and authority to take the evidence and to report the same to the Court with his findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for a decree -- all subject to examination, consideration, approval, modification or other disposal by the Court. The special master shall have authority (1) to employ competent stenographic and clerical assistants, (2) to fix the times and places of taking the evidence, and (3) to issue subpoenas to secure the attendance of witnesses and to administer oaths. When the special master's report of his findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for a decree is completed the clerk of the court shall cause the same to be printed; and when the same is presented to the Court in printed form the parties will be accorded a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Court, within which to present exceptions. The special master shall be allowed his actual expenses and a reasonable compensation for his services to be fixed hereafter by the Court. The allowances to him, the compensation paid to his stenographic and clerical assistants and the cost of printing his report shall be charged against and be borne by the parties in such proportions as the Court hereafter may direct.
If the parties to the related suit of State of Michigan v. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, now pending in this Court, so elect and so notify the special master they shall be permitted to participate in the taking of evidence and in the hearing before the special master in like manner and with like effect as if that suit had been consolidated with this cause by the Court's order; and the Court specially reserves to itself authority to order such a consolidation if it becomes proper to do so.

If the appointment herein made of a special master is not accepted, or if the place becomes vacant during the recess of the Court, the Chief Justice shall have authority to make a new designation which shall have the same effect as if originally made by the Court herein.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1925.

ORDER.

IT IS ORDERED that Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Rule 35 of this Court be amended so that said paragraphs shall respectively read as follows:

3. Notice of the filing of the petition, together with a copy of the petition, printed record and supporting brief, shall be served by the petitioner on counsel for the respondent within 10 days after the filing, and due proof of service shall be filed with the Clerk. If the United States, or any of its officers, is respondent and has been represented in the court below by the Attorney General of the United States or any of his subordinates, the service of the petition, record and brief shall be made on the Solicitor General at Washington, D. C. Counsel for the respondent shall have 20 days, and where he resides in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, or an outlying possession, shall have 25 days, after notice, within which to file 40 printed copies of an opposing brief, conforming to Rules 24 and 25.

(a) Except during the summer recess, a brief in opposition filed on or before the Friday preceding the motion day on which the petition is to be submitted will be received. If the date for filing a brief in opposition falls in the summer recess, the brief may be filed within 40 days after the service of the notice, but this enlargement shall not extend the time to a later date than September 10th.

4. On the first motion day following the expiration of the 20 days or 25 days, as the case may be, the petition, record and briefs shall be submitted by the clerk to the court for its consideration.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1925.

ORDER.

IT IS ORDERED that Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Rule 38 of this Court be amended so that said paragraphs shall respectively read as follows:

4. A petition to this court for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment of the Court of Claims shall be accompanied by a certified transcript of the record in that court, consisting of the pleadings, findings of fact, judgment and opinion of the court, but not the evidence. The petition shall contain only a summary and short statement of the matter involved and the reasons relied on for the allowance of the writ. The petition and record shall be filed with the clerk and 30 copies thereof shall be printed under his supervision in the same way and upon the same terms that records on writs of error and appeals are required to be printed, save that the estimated cost of printing shall be paid within five days after the estimate is furnished by the clerk and if payment is not so made the petition may be summarily dismissed. When the petition and record are printed the petitioner shall forthwith serve a copy thereof on the respondent, or his counsel of record, and shall file with the clerk due proof thereof.

5. Within twenty days after the petition and record are printed the petitioner shall file with the clerk 30 copies of a printed brief in support of the petition—the brief to conform to the provisions of Rules 24 and 25; and the petitioner shall at the same time file with the clerk due proof that he has served a copy of the brief on the respondent or his counsel, together with a notice that the petition will be submitted to this court on the first motion day after the expiration of 20 days from the date of such service. The respondent may file with the clerk 30 printed copies of an opposing brief, conforming to Rules 24 and 25, at any time during that 20-day period. On the first motion day following the expiration of that period the petition and record, with the briefs filed, shall be submitted by the clerk to the court for its consideration.

The provisions of subdivision (a) of paragraph 3 of Rule 35 shall apply to briefs in opposition to petitions for writs of certiorari to review judgments of the Court of Claims.

ORDER.

Order relating to compensation of officers and employees in the Marshal's Office and the Reporter's Office and to the compensation of the law clerks and secretaries to the Justices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927.

IT IS ORDERED that the compensation of the officers and employees connected with the office of the Marshal of this Court for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, to be paid out of the appropriation of $106,046 made under the heading "United States Supreme Court" by the Act of April 29, 1926, is hereby fixed as follows:

Marshal	$ 4,500
Assistant and chief clerk	3,570
Librarian and file clerk	3,420
Crier and assistant chief clerk	2,880
Attendant in courtroom	1,730
4 Door-keepers at $1,730 each	6,920
14 Messengers at $1,730 each	24,220
2 Skilled laborers at $1,140 each	2,280
4 Pages at $110 per month each for 8½ months	3,740

It is further ordered that the compensation of the officers and employees connected with the office of the Reporter of this Court for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, to be paid out of the appropriation of $106,046 made under the heading "United States Supreme Court" by the Act of April 29, 1926, as supplemented by the sum transferred to that appropriation by section 4 of the Act of May 29, 1926, is hereby fixed as follows:

Assistant to the Reporter	$3,600
Additional assistant to the Reporter, deemed by the Court necessary to enable the Reporter to expidite the publication of the Court's reports	2,500

It is further ordered that the compensation of the law clerks and secretaries to the Justices of this Court for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, to be paid out of the appropriation of $106,046 made under the heading "United States Supreme Court" by the Act of April 29, 1926, is hereby fixed as follows:

Secretary to the Chief Justice	$4,400
Law clerk to the Chief Justice	3,600
Law clerk to Mr. Justice Holmes	3,600
Law clerk to Mr. Justice Van Devanter	3,600
Secretary to Mr. Justice Van Devanter	2,000
Law clerk to Mr. Justice McReynolds	3,600
Secretary to Mr. Justice McReynolds	2,000
Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Brandeis	3,600
Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Sutherland	4,500
Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Butler	3,600
Secretary to Mr. Justice Butler	2,000
Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Sanford	3,600
Law Clerk to Mr. Justice Stone	3,600
Secretary to Mr. Justice Stone	2,500

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,

1195 vs.

R. E. Ellzey.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Kinney-Coastal Oil Company and Texas Production Company, Petitioners,

1198 vs.

Michael F. Kieffer, Orpha M. Kieffer, Herbert L. Lemming, et al., etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Simon Platt, Receiver for
Manufacturers' Union,
Petitioner,
1096 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Frank Bornn, trading as the Bornn
Distilling Company,
Petitioner,
1099 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William Walter Owen,
Petitioner,
1172 vs.
George Heimann.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Pascagoula National Bank of Moss Point and Pascagoula, Mississippi, Petitioner,
1179 vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta and Oscar Newton, as Federal Reserve Agent etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. O. Jones, as Trustee, Petitioner,
1187 vs.
J. B. Adams.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Estelle L. Mattice, Petitioner,
1188 vs.
Nathan N. Klawans.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Otto H. Reinke, Mette Reinke, Mary Reinke, et al.,

Petitioners,

1190 vs.

J. B. Hire, as Administrator of the Estate of Julius Zuandt, deceased, Carl Zuandt, Emma Luise Marie Thiede, nee Zuandt et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Louis Brenner, Samuel Brenner, Benjamin Brenner, et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

1191 vs.

Arthur H. Lamborn, Henry B. Hutchings, George H. Logan et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Matthew Smith Tea, Coffee & Grocery Company, Petitioner,

1192 vs.

A. H. Lamborn, H. B. Hutchings, G. H. Logan, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

T. A. Helm,
Petitioner,
1193 vs.
United Central Oil Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Henry B. Hovland,
Petitioner,
1194 vs.
Hoval A. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

H. M. Smith, E. Olsen, F. Osterman,
et al., Petitioners,
1196 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. W. Gallaher,

Petitioner,

1197 vs.

The Huntington Engineering Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bessie M. Mack,

Petitioner,

1200 vs.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Paul Dawson and Celia Dawson,

Petitioners,

1201 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. A. Walker and wife, Elizabeth Walker, Petitioners,
1202 vs.
George C. Hopkins, as Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

David Belais, Inc., Petitioner,
1205 vs.
Goldsmith Bros. Smelting & Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William S. Kreiner, Petitioner,
1207 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mercantile Bank of the Americas, Inc., Petitioner,
1209 vs.
Flower Lighterage Company, Inc., and New York Dock Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1210 vs.
A. L. Jeffcoat.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles Land, Petitioner,
1211 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

M. B. Davis, alias Mood Davis,
Petitioner,
1212 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Isadore Keslinsky,
Petitioner,
1214 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles West, Petitioner,
1217 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Franklin E. Kerr, Petitioner,
1223 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John Lapique, Assignee of the Estate of Miguel Leonis, et al.,

1224 Petitioner, vs. The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

George Remus,

Petitioner,

1257 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

O R D E R.

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided, and all other business of the term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.

VOL

19

UME

26

At the Capitol of
and District of Columbia, b
of the United States, on th
the same month) in the year
twenty-six and of the Indep
and fifty-first, the Supreme
to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Will
Oliv
Will
Jame
Loui
Geor
Pier
Edwa
Harl
Frank K. C
William R.

Proclamation being

On motion first ma
McConnell, It is ordered tha
Georgia, be admitted to prac
and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first ma
Robinson, It is ordered that
of West Virginia, be admitte
this Court, and he was sworn

the United States, in the City of Washington,
eing the present Seat of the National Government
e first Monday of October (being the 4th day of
of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and
endence of the United States the one hundred
e Court of the United States met agreeably

liam H. Taft, Chief Justice.
ver Wendell Holmes,
lis Van Devanter,
es C. McReynolds,
is D. Brandeis,
Associate Justices.
rge Sutherland,
rce Butler,
ard T. Sanford,
lan F. Stone.
Green, Esquire, Marshal .
. Stansbury, Clerk.

; made the Court is opened.

ade to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M.
at Pat Haralson, Esquire, of Blairsville, State of
ctice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court,
.

ade to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira E.
John T. Graham, Esquire, of Huntington, State
d to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Peyton, It is ordered that D. B. Puryear, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Robira, It is ordered that Percy T. Ogden, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, It is ordered that Theodore D. Peyser, Esquire, and George E. Edelin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Maddox, It is ordered that J. William Tomlinson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Aiken, It is ordered that William W. Dimmick, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, It is ordered that Charles Wellborn, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and Joseph J. Cotter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses J. Konnoscn, It is ordered that Hyman E. Konnoscn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Renning, It is ordered that John L. Sweeney, Esquire, of Winslow, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Sumner Ford, Esquire, of New York City, be, admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Clark, It is ordered that Frank P. Hamilton, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Clark, It is ordered that Emmet L. Holbrook, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Carl A. Hiaasen, Esquire, of Fort Lauderdale, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James L. Fort, It is ordered that Benj. H. Hill III, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia; W. A. McClellan, Esquire, and W. O. Cooper, Jr., Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Frank Harrison, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor Mitchell General, It is ordered that Harold Ammon Carmichael, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Spilman, It is ordered that Paul W. Scott, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Norman J. Morrisson, Esquire, and H. R. Gamble, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Carl B. Berter, Esquire, of Quincy, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen V. Carey, It is ordered that Mark M. Litchman, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, It is ordered that John David Watkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Fitch, It is ordered that Montgomery S. Winning, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arlon V. Cushman, It is ordered that H. Dorsey Spencer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Orig. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

The return to the rule to show cause in this case was filed on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendants.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Orig. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On motion of Mr. Edward A. Harriman in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs of Mr. Edward A. Harriman and Mr. Thomas B. Adams as amici curiae in this cause.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
10 Orig. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the complainant to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said bill of complaint, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

10 vs.

Lucia E. Blount, in her own right and as administratrix, c. t. a., of the Estate of Henry F. Blount, deceased.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Maddox (Mattox),

Plaintiff in error,

668 vs.

The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

I, O. C. Fuller, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States was plaintiff, and Henry Maddox (Mattox) was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 14th day of April, A. D. 1921, in favor of the said The United States, and against the said Henry Maddox (Mattox), and that on the 9th day of June, A. D. 1921, said Henry Maddox (Mattox) sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at Atlanta, Georgia, this 18th day of September, A. D. 1926, 1:05 P. M.

(SEAL)

(Signed) O. C. Fuller, Clerk,

By Jon Dean Steward, Chief Deputy Clerk."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Rossi et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
86 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

J. McGuire,
Appellant,
99 vs.
Railroad Labor Board.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal, in accordance with a stipulation of counsel, filed in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the petition without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dan Bartoncini,
Plaintiff in error,
194 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss or to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the

Frank K. Bowers, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

366 vs.

New York and Albany Lighterage Company.

Frank K. Bowers, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

367 vs.

Lloyd W. Seaman.

Frank K. Bowers, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

368 vs.

Thomas Staples Fuller.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

395 vs.

Solomon Novack.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error.

L. J. Riggs,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Siegel Workman, United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia.

L. J.(Bear Cat) Riggs,

Petitioner,

560 vs.

The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf leave was granted to withdraw brief of the respondents and file substituted brief on or before Friday next.

Hector N. Zahn and A. W. Hoss,
Plaintiffs in error,
196 vs.
Board of Public Works of the City of Los Angeles.

The motion to advance and assign this cause for argument with case No. 31 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt in behalf of Mr. A. J. Hill for the plaintiffs in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William W. Bride in behalf of Mr. Jess E. Stephens and Mr. Lucius P. Green for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, et al.,
Appellants,
31 vs.
Ambler Realty Company.

On motion of Mr. Newton D. Baker in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of George T. Simpson as amicus curiae in this cause.

Charles B. Beery,
Plaintiff in error,
232 vs.
James G. Houghton, as Inspector of Buildings for the City of Minneapolis.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier for the defendant in error.

State of Missouri at the relation and to the use of Wabash Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
69 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri et al., etc., et al.

The motion for leave to brief of The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David W. Peters in support of the motion, and by Mr. Julius T. Muench, Mr. Oliver Senti, and Mr. Marion C. Early for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Rush Meadows,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Jesse P. Crawford in behalfof Mr. Hugh L. Dickson for the petitioner, leave was granted to file additional brief on behalf of the petitioner on or before Friday next.

New York, Ontario and Western Railway Company, Appellant,
564 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. L. Andrus for the appellant.

Seward K. Lowe et al., Petitioners,
158 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

The death of Seward K. Lowe, one of the petitioners in this cause, having been suggested, it is ordered that Susan Lowe, as the petitioner herein, be allowed to continue this cause in her own right, on motion of Mr. David Wiener in that behalf.

The State Bank, Petitioner,
508 vs.
Philip Applebaum.

On motion of Mr. David Wiener in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief for the respondent.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
357 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.
Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
358 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.
Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
365 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

The motion to reassign these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellee in No. 357, and by Mr. William M. Dykman for the appellee in No. 358 in opposition thereto, and the motion was denied.

T. L. Smith, Sr., et al.,
Appellants,
648 vs.
Louis J. Wilson et al.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Bryan for the appellees, and by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the appellants.

H. L. Kveland et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
592 vs.
Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

On motion of Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in behalf of Mr. A. K. Gardner for the respondent, leave was granted to file brief for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. George G. Bryant,
Plaintiff in error,
332 vs.
Charles F. Zimmermann, Chief of Police of Buffalo et al.

On motion of Mr. W. F. Zumbrunn in that behalf this cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
577 vs.
E. B. Spiller et al.

On motion of Mr. Richard H. Wilmer in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Edward J. White and Thomas T. Railey for the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

The United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
439 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. B. Angell in behalf of Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the appellant.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
505 vs.
The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

The motion to defer the consideration of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases until the petitions in Nos. 653 and 654 have been submitted, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey , and the motion was denied.

Seaboard Air Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
506 vs.
The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

Clarence H. Myers
65 vs.
Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

The motion to bring up the entire record and cause in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Clark, Mr. Roger J. Whiteford, and Mr. Walter B. Guy for the Hurley Motor Company, Incorporated.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
13 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion of the States of Michigan and New York for leave to amend the bill of complaint in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Ferris in behalf of Mr. Andrew B. Dougherty and Mr. Albert Ottinger in support of the motion, and by Mr. James M. Beck for the Sanitary District of Chicago in opposition thereto, with leave to counsel to file printed briefs on or before Friday next.

The City of Philadelphia ex relatione Daniel J. Furey, Taxpayer et al., Appellants,
515 vs.
The Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Regan, Jr., for the appellants.

M. Hartley Dodge,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Minnie M. Allison et al.

The motion to defer consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari and for leave to file brief for the respondents within two weeks granted on motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in behalf of counsel for the respondents.

Kate Tendler,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Morris Tendler.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Meeers for the petitioner.

Scott M. Atkin,
Petitioner,
543 vs.
Nathan H. Baier et al.

On motion of Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill in behalf of Mr. William M. Toomer and Mr. George P. Garrett for the petitioner, leave was granted to file additional brief for the petitioner on or before Friday next.

In re Disbarment of
John H. Adriaans,
No. --

The motion to vacate the order herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Adriaans pro se.

Josephine Stipcich,
533 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance
Company.

The motion to bring up the entire record and cause in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long in behalf of Mr. C. C. Fulton for Stipcich.

The Philippine Sugar Estates
Development Company, Ltd., Inc.,
Petitioner,
550 vs.
Gabriela Andrea de Coster.

On motion of Mr. Chester I. Long in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief for the respondent.

Daniel J. Hart,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
H. B. North et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon Hobbin for the petitioner.

Jacob Goldman,
Plaintiff in error,
248 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Montgomery S. Winning in behalf of Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Edward C. Fitch for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
ex rel. Julio M. Homan (Checa),
Petitioner,
391 vs.
George E. Williams, Criminal Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans, Louisiana.

The motion to defer the submission of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause until Monday, October 25th, was granted per stipulation of counsel, on motion of Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in that behalf.

Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
467 vs.
Sherman D. Hill, Administrator, etc.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for writ of certiorari to correct the record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry R. Gower in behalf of Mr. William A. Eggers and Mr. C. W. McMullan and Mr. Morison R. Waite for the petitioner.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
1 Orig. vs.
The Tennessee Copper Company et al.

On motion of Mr. George M. Napier for the complainant the rule to show cause in this case was discharged.

Public Utilities Commission of
the State of Kansas, C. M. Read,
J. W. Greenleaf et al.,
Appellants,
7 vs.
The Arkansas Valley Interurban
Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court
of the United States for the
District of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Great Western Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
321 vs.
Marian S. Jackson.

On writ of certiorari to the
Supreme Court of the State of
Minnesota.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs or disbursements to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dad's Auto Accessories, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
581 vs.
City of Nashville, George J. Tompkins,
J. W. Bauman, and Hillary E. House,
etc.

In error to the Supreme Court
of the State of Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Thomson,
Plaintiff in error,
103 vs.
Alexander W. Thomson, Roderick W. McKinnon et al., copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Thomson and McKinnon.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Robbins, Mr. Silas H. Strawn, and Mr. Walter H. Jacobs for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt and Mr. Samuel B. King for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Canal-Commercial Trust and Savings Bank and Union Indemnity Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
524 vs.
Earl Brewer.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Cutrer for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Garner Wynne Green, and Mr. Chalmers Potter for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Alexander Ackerson,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Ackerson pro se.

Ethel Jones,
Plaintiff in error,
630 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins for the plaintiff in error.

David F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
657 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Mitchell pro se.

James Stewart and Company,
Plaintiff in error,
290 vs.
Dominick Rivara.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harrington Putnam and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Thomas H. Larkin,
Plaintiff in error,
652 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Larkin pro se.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn and Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Rothschild Francis,
Petitioner,
371 vs.
George Washington Williams, Judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Wallerstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Gibson for the respondent.

Pulitzer Publishing Company,
Petitioner,
374 vs.
Houston Printing Company.

John F. Green for the petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
376 vs.
H. K. Wellborn and J. A. Walls, under the firm name of Wellborn and Walls.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Wiley and Mr. Edgar B. Kinsworthy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tillman B. Parks for the respondents.

Ray C. Simmons,
Petitioner,
377 vs.
Edward P. Swan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy S. Bryant for the petitioner.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
379 vs.
T. A. Binford, Sheriff of Harris County, Texas et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam Streetman and Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jewel P. Lightfoot, Mr. John W. Brady, and Mr. George L. Edwards for the respondents.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. George Edgeley et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam Streetman and Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the petitioners.
380	
International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The Texas Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam Streetman and Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the petitioners, and by Mr. Herbert S. Garrett for the respondent.
381	
Frank C. Hart, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin L. Pipes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
382	
Town of Flagstaff, Petitioner, vs. William D. Walsh, as the surviving partner of the partnership of McLean & Walsh, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Bennett and Mr. John L. Gust for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry C. Bodkin for the respondent.
383	

American Smelting and Refining Company, Petitioner,
384 vs.
George Campbell Carson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Earl, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. George Donworth, and Mr. John C. Higgins for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Miller and Mr. A. W. Boyken for the respondent.

City of Hammond, Petitioner,
385 vs.
Schappi Bus Line, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener and Mr. John A. Gavit for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Whinery for the respondent.

City of Hammond, Petitioner,
386 vs.
Marina Bus Line and Transportation Company,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Michener and Mr. John A. Gavit for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse J. Ricks and Mr. Edmond W. Hebel for the respondent.

Mercantile Trust Company of St. Louis, Missouri, Petitioner,
387 vs.
Wilmot Road District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Rose, Mr. S. A. Mitchell, Mr. S. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. F. Loughborough, and Mr. A. W. Dobyns for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert E. Wiley for the respondent.

Sylvia Lake Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Northern Ore Company et al.

389

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin L. Garvin and Mr. Alfred C. Reeves for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry Purcell for the respondents.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Warren Landers.

390

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Stuart, Mr. J. F. Sharpe, Mr. M. K. Cruce, Mr. Ben Franklin, Mr. E. T. Miller, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. Clinton Harris.

392

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, and Mr. Arthur P. Drury for the petitioner.

Hush Meadows, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

393

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh L. Dickson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue etc., Petitioner, vs. Electric Reduction Company.

394

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

The United States of America substituted for H. Bergman, Master of the Steamship "Henry County", Petitioner, 396 vs. A cargo of about 3253 tons of coal laden on board the Steamship "Henry County," etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, and Mr. Harold F. Birnbaum for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the respondent.
The United States of America substituted for Martin Miller, Master of the Steamship "Franklin County," Petitioner, 397 vs. A cargo of about 3248 tons of coal laden on board the Steamship "Franklin County", etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, and Mr. Harold F. Birnbaum for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the respondent.
N. S. Josey Guano Company and N. S. Josey Company et al., Petitioners, 399 vs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Manning, Mr. John H. Manning, and Mr. P. W. McMullan for the petitioners.
The United States of America ex rel. L. Margulies & Sons, Inc., Petitioner, 400 vs. J. Raymond McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson and Mr. Lewis K. Torbet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. A. H. Phillips, Tax Collector for Webster Parish, Louisiana.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Hunter for the respondent.
401	
Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. A. H. Phillips, Tax Collector for Webster Parish, Louisiana.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Hunter for the respondent.
402	
Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. M. H. Sandlin, Tax Assessor.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Hunter for the respondent.
403	
J. W. McIntosh, Comptroller of the Currency, et al., Petitioners, vs. Miss Ruth M. Jackson and Mrs. Anna M. Scott.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Elliott and Mr. Thomas F. Green for the petitioner.
404	

Louis Horwitz and S. Abramson,
Petitioners,
405 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Behrendt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Maurice R. Shaw, Owner of the Derrick Barge "Holly",
Petitioner,
407 vs.
Western Assurance Company of Toronto, Canada.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Curtis Tilton and Mr. Willard M. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry J. Bigham for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
408 vs.
John B. Semple and Company, a former Pennsylvania Corporation, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. John R. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Woods for the respondents.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
409 vs.
Arkansas Land & Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Q. Mahaffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. F. McFaddin for the respondent.

Chicago Steamship Lines, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
410 vs.
United States Lloyds, Incorporated, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Kremer for the petitioners, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Henry N. Longley for the respondents.

Grace Henry and Mae Henry, Petitioners,
411 vs.
Olive Henry et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Adams and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioners.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al., Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport, Mr. Charles Martindale, and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the petitioners.

Harry Barusch, Petitioner,
413 vs.
G. W. Brainard, as Trustee of Charles H. Durel et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar C. Chapman for the petitioner.

United Cigar Stores Company of America, Petitioner,
415 vs.
Edward R. Hayher, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bertrand Barnett, trading as Culver and Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol. M. Stroock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Leavitt for the respondent.

B. F. Trappey et al., trading as B. F. Trappey and Sons, Petitioners,
419 vs.
McIlhenny Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Symons for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph S. Clark and Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.

George Weinstein, Petitioner,
420 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Byron M. Coon for the respondent.

American Chain Company, Inc. Petitioner,
423 vs.
Chester N. Weaver, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Duncan and Mr. Gilbert H. Montague for the petitioner, and by Mr. William K. White for the respondent.

Franklin D'Olier et al., etc., Petitioners,
425 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Marvin Haynes, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, and Mr. Robert H. Montgomery for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Fred K. Dyar, and Mr. John R. Wheeler for the respondent.

Eugene Bergron et al.,
Petitioners,
426 vs.
Ernest G. Hellsten, as bailee of the owner, Pere Marquette Lines steamer, claimant of the American vessel Nevada, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ambrose Gherini, Mr. Irving H. Frank, and Mr. Nathan H. Frank for the respondent.

Julius Kessler and Company, Inc., Petitioner,
427 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Breed and Mr. Edward A. Craighill, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

James Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company et al.,
Petitioners,
428 vs.
Cora Seimer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Rearick for the petitioners.

Carl B. Anderson,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Harry J. Bovard,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General

William M. Jones,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward E. Gates for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mord Carter,
Petitioner,
433 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Anthony A. Scheib,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Frumberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Margaret Collins, Administratrix ad prosequendum of the Estate of Martin Collins, deceased,
Petitioner,
435 vs.
Erie Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Susan Brandeis and Mr. Nathan Probst, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clement K. Corbin for the respondent.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
436 vs.
Walter Peirson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. Henry M. Earle, and Mr. Joseph W. Henderson for the petitioner.

Daniel J. Hart,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
H. B. North, A. E. Fisher, and A. V. Essington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon Robbin for the petitioner.

Mrs. Gertrude S. Ponder,
Petitioner,
438 vs.
Lamar Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. B. Warren, Mr. Joseph D. Barksdale, and Mr. Albert H. Van Hook for the petitioner.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
440 vs.
Steam tug Cutchogue, her engines, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. William J. Dean for the respondents.

Irvin McD. Garfield, as Receiver of B. B. & R. Knight, Inc.,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
The Mallory Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Hunter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray Rood Allen for the respondent.

J. A. Kemp et al.,
Petitioners,
442 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Weeks for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the respondent.

Max Hart,
Petitioner,
445 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. Louis B. Eppstein, Mr. Ira W. Hirshfield, and Mr. Lawrence H. Axman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes and Mr. Maurice Goodman for the respondents.

Max Hart,
Petitioner,
446 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. Louis B. Eppstein, Mr. Ira W. Hirshfield, and Mr. Lawrence H. Axman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes and Mr. Maurice Goodman for the respondents.

S. D. Guggenheim et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
449 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

William Lee Popham,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McNeill, Mr. Julius C. Martin, and Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Procter & Gamble Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
451 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank F. Dinsmore for the petitioners.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
494 vs.
The Procter and Gamble Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Bayard T. Hainer for the petitioner.

Alexander Menaregidis, in behalf of Andreas Menaregidis,
Petitioner,
455 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Sotiouros Christoulas, also known as Christ Lawyer,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

George F. Pawling & Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. P. M. Cox for the respondent.

Roy Gay,
Petitioner,
458 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart. A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Byron M. Coon for the respondent.

Russell Gay,
Petitioner,
459 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart. A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Byron M. Coon for the respondent.

Harry Washer, alias Harry The Jew, Petitioner,
460 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart. A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

H. M. Albury, Petitioner,
461 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart. A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

James Thompson and The J. L. Hudson Company, doing business etc., et al., Petitioners,
462 vs.
The Vogue Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Banning and Mr. Thomas A. Banning for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harry D. Nims and Mr. Minturn DeS. Verdi for the respondent.

George Belvin and John McGowan, Petitioners,
463 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Bowden for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Cripple Creek & Colorado Springs Railroad Company, Petitioner,
464 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Elliott and Mr. C. C. Hamlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. Granville Curry and Mr. P. J. Farrell for the respondent.

Wallace R. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii et al., Petitioners,
465 vs.
T. Tokushige et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Lymer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph Lightfoot and Mr. Joseph B. Poindexter for the respondents.

Jacob P. Teter, Petitioner,
466 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Ert. Slack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
467 vs.
Sherman D. Hill, Administrator of the Estate of Thomas J. Hill, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Eggers, Mr. C. W. McMullen, and Mr. Morison R. Waite for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas M. Honan for the respondent.

Oregon and California Railroad Company, Petitioner,
468 vs.
Andrew B. Hammond and Charles J. Winton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben C. Dey and Mr. Alfred A. Hampson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Carey and Mr. James B. Kerr for the respondent.

Oregon and California Railroad Company, Petitioner,
469 vs.
Booth-Kelley Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben C. Dey and Mr. Alfred A. Hampson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Norris and Mr. Glenn E. Husted for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
470 vs.
Curtis & Company Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the petitioner.

W. J. McInnes, Receiver of the Citizens National Bank of Roswell, New Mexico, Petitioner,
471 vs.
The American Surety Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Renzo D. Bowers for the petitioner.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Federal Agent, Petitioner,
473 vs.
W. M. Grantham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. McKnight, Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, and Mr. Charles C. Huff for the petitioner.

Howard P. Converse and Edwin P. Bliss, trading as Converse and Company, Petitioners,
474 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Eric Lange and A. H. Bergstrom, Copartners, etc., Petitioners,
475 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Mary D. A. Sayles et al., etc., Petitioners,
476 vs.
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Williston, Mr. Robert B. Dresser, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioners, and by Mr. Eldon Bisbee, Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., and Mr. Arthur M. Allen for the respondents.

Joshua Russell, Petitioner,
477 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Breitenstein, Mr. William L. Day, and Mr. Luther Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Merle H. Copeland, Petitioner,
478 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Day, Mr. Luther Day and Mr. Joseph C. Breitenstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Warren E. Barnett, Petitioner,
479 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Breitenstein, Mr. William L. Day, and Mr. Luther Day for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
480 vs.
Ernest R. Gubler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Porter, Mr. George H. Smith, Mr. William R. Harr, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. R. Callister for the respondent.

Earl B. Barnes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Thomas H. Cowley, Paul E. Brady et al., etc., Petitioners,
481 vs.
William Schatzkin et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Saul S. Myers, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. Edwin L. Garvin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harold Nathan for the respondents.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receivers of the Wabash Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company, Petitioners,
482 vs.
George J. Gould et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. James Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the respondents.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
483 vs.
The Texas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel B. Dabney and Mr. Sam Streetman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harry T. Klein, Mr. H. S. Garrett, and Mr. Charles A. Wilcox for the respondent.

Milton F. Webster, Petitioner,
484 vs.
Joseph T. Terry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake and Mr. F. W. Clements for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. Louis R. Mehlenger for the respondent.

Jacinto Moss et al etc.,
Petitioners,
486 vs.
John H. Sherburne and Howard Stockton, Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Holt for the petitioners, and by Mr. John H. Sherburne and Mr. Howard Stockton, Jr., pro se.

The Village of Terrace Park,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
Russell Errett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Weld Peck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Russell Errett pro se and Mr. James J. Muir for the respondent.

Albert Carelli,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. A. Musmanno for the petitioner.

Lena B. McKee and Fred McKee,
Trustees etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
490 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph, James F. Oyster, and J. Franklin Bell, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. H. Stephens and Mr. Robert L. Williams for the respondents.

Universal Rim Company,
Petitioner,
491 vs.
Firestone Tire and Rubber
Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rudolph William Lotz and Mr. Arthur William Nelson for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. L. Ely and Mr. F. O. Richey for the respondents.

The Standard Electric Stove
Company, Petitioner,
493 vs.
The Toledo, St. Louis and Western
Railroad.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver B. Snider for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. E. McInnis for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway
Company, Petitioner,
496 vs.
Eunice Pearson, Administratrix of the
Estate of J. L. Pearson, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller and Mr. Edward L. Westbrooke for the petitioner.

E. Paul Yaselli,
Petitioner,
497 vs.
Guy D. Goff.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Paul Yaselli pro se, and by Mr. Nathan A. Smyth for the respondent.

The United States of America
ex rel. Helen L. Givens,
Petitioner,
498 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the
Interior of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Spencer Gordon, and Mr. Newell W. Ellison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. George R. Barse for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Howard T. Jones, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Edward H. Horton for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Howard T. Jones, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Edward H. Horton for the respondent.

E. W. Bliss Company, Petitioner,
503 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton and Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Perry W. Howard, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
505 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, Mr. F. W. Gwathmey, Mr. James F. Wright, and Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles McH. Howard and Mr. George H. Tower for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
506 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen, Mr. F. W. Gwathmey, Mr. Thomas W. Davis, and Mr. James P. Wright for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles McH. Howard and Mr. George H. Tower for the respondent.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
507 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. Merritt U. Hayden, and Mr. James F. Green for the respondent.

The State Bank, Petitioner,
508 vs.
Philip Applebaum.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald Palmer and Mr. Max L. Rosenstein for the petitioner.

Submarine Signal Company, Petitioner,
510 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip B. Buzzell, Mr. Andrew B. Duvall, and Mr. Elmer T. Bell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,
Petitioner,
511 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Kleindienst, Mr. W. C. Reid, and Mr. Levi H. David for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter for the respondents.

Security Trust Company, Bankruptcy Receiver,
Petitioner,
513 vs.
Charles J. De Land, Receiver of the Detroit Mortgage Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Long for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carl W. Mosier for the respondent.

The Detroit United Railway,
Petitioner,
514 vs.
Alfred Leroy Craven.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic T. Harward for the petitioner.

Ralph A. Horton,
Petitioner,
516 vs.
Cary A. Hardee, Governor et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Scott M. Loftin, Mr. James E. Calkins, and Mr. John P. Stokes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis P. Fleming and Mr. Marvin C. McIntosh for the respondents.

Joseph Laveirge and John B. Arnold and N. B. Arnold, Petitioners,
517 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent of the President under the Transportation Act.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Webster Ballinger and Mr. John B. Arnold for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Pedro Capo-Rodriguez for the respondent.

J. W. Craig, Petitioner,
518 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Hoftzger for the petitioner.

The Steel and Tube Company of America, Petitioner,
519 vs.
Dingess Rum Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild, Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove, and Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Douglas W. Brown for the respondent.

Auburn and Alton Coal Company, Petitioner,
520 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Miller and Mr. Haines H. Hargrett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Kate Tendler,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Morris Tendler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty and Mr. Edwin A. Meeers for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Hilton Jackson and Mr. Morgan H. Beach for the respondent.

Hilda Roberts et al.,
Petitioners,
523 vs.
Chris Yegen et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Lowndes Maury for the petitioners, and by Mr. George Hurd for the respondents.

Ross Banta,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas A. Flynn and Mr. Joseph E. Morrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving partner of Howard Phelps and Charles H. Phelps, copartners, trading under the firm name etc.,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell L. Alden and Mr. Charles S. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Mechanics and Metals National Bank for the City of New York,
Petitioner,
532 vs.
J. C. Buchanan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank M. Patterson and Mr. D. H. Linebaugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. W. McKenzie for the respondent.

Ethel Croker White et al.,
Petitioners,
534 vs.
Bula Croker, Individually etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell and Mr. J. T. G. Crawford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis P. Fleming and Mr. Samuel T. Ansell for the respondents.

W. R. Grace and Company,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
The Panama Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. Ezra G. Benedict Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the respondent.

Charles Waxman,
petitioner,
536 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Waxman pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Aetna Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Hermina Bundsoho.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Y. Freeman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, and Mr. T. W. Bramhall for the respondent.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
539 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglas W. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Martin, Mr. John H. Holt, and Mr. Rufus S. Dinkle for the respondent.

Richmond Screw Anchor Company, Inc., Petitioner,
540 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, Mr. Archibald Cox, Mr. O. Ellery Edwards, and Mr. William H. Kenyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Frank McGarry and James McGarry, Petitioners,
541 vs.
John J. Lentz et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. Arthur I. Vorys for the petitioners.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
542 vs.
Mary I. Aeby.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt U. Hayden, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. James P. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. Patrick H. Cullen and Mr. Thos. T. Fauntleroy for the respondent.

Scott M. Atkin, Petitioner,
543 vs.
Nathan H. Baier et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Toomer and Mr. George P. Garrett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Halsted L. Ritter for the respondents.

The United States, Petitioner,
544 vs.
May McKinney and William Ayer McKinney, Executors, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry H. Simmes and Mr. W. Clyde Jones for the respondents.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
546
v. George Flint et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James K. Symmers for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Allen Dawson, Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, and Mr. William J. Dean for the respondents.

John James Jackson et al.,
Petitioners,
547 vs.
Steamship Archimedes, Lamport and Holt Line, Limited, Claimant.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder and Mr. William J. Dean for the respondent.

The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company, Ltd., Inc.,
Petitioner,
550 vs.
Gabriela Andrea de Coster.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Fisher and Mr. C. A. DeWitt for the petitioner.

James E. Arnold,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
Ross A. Collins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Richardson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Barbour for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
J. H. King.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. McKnight, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson and Mr. Charles C. Huff for the petitioner.

The City of Toledo et al.,
Petitioners,
554 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Seiders for the petitioners, and by Mr. U. G. Denman and Mr. Karl E. Burr for the respondent.

W. R. Grace and Company,
Petitioner,
555 vs.
Toyo Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Orrick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Dozier for the respondent.

A. W. Duckett and Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
557 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted by Mr. Ernie Adamson and Mr. Don R. Almy for the petitioner.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
The United States of America,
owner of Steam Tug Barrenfork.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. T. Loyall, Mr. George M. Lanning, Mr. B. W. Knight, and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

L. J. Riggs,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
Siegel Workman, United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Belcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

L. J. (Bear Cat) Riggs,
Petitioner,
560 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Belcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
562 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Eugene Underwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondents.

New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Eugene Underwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondents.

M. Samuel and Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
The Second National Bank of Toledo.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morris D. Kopple for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Morris for the respondent.

New State Land Company et al.,
Petitioners,
566 vs.
Robert Kelley and Sukey Kelley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Neff, Mr. R. C. Allen, and Mr. I. J. Underwood for the respondents.

United States Steel Products Company, Claimant and owner of S. S. Steel Trader et al.,
Petitioners,
568 vs.
Donald J. Adams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, Mr. Harry McCall, Mr. James Henry Bruns, and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioners.

Louis Rauch,
Petitioner,
569 vs.
A. F. Duff.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gordon Garland Lyell for the petitioner.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
571 vs.
J. J. Cammack.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Tallichet and Mr. H. M. Garwood for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alexander White Spence for the respondent.

Calcasieu National Bank of Southwest Louisiana,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Alfred Campbell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. McCoy for the petitioner.

William G. Benham and Dwight Harrison, Petitioners,
573 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert R. Nevin and Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William P. Williams and Frank E. Lyman, Commissioners of Public Works, etc., Petitioners,
576 vs.
General Outdoor Advertising Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jay R. Benton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry and Mr. Robert Gallagher for the respondents.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
577 vs.
E. B. Spiller et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. H. Cowan, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. Walter H. Saunders for the respondents.

Henderson County, Tennessee,
Petitioner,
578 vs.
Sovereign Camp, Woodmen of the World.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Fowler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Claflin Allen, Jr., for the respondent.

George Langstaff,
Petitioner,
584 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States, Kentucky, District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles K. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the respondent.

A. I. Winsett et al.,
Petitioners,
585 vs.
H. J. Spurway, Receiver of the Tucson National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Curley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis M. Hartman for the respondent.

M. Webby et al.,
Petitioners,
586 vs.
H. J. Spurway, Receiver of the Tucson National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Curley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis M. Hartman for the respondent.

The State of Montana,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
Sunburst Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. A. Foot for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Hurd for the respondent.

Federal Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
Mrs. Jennie M. Rascoe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Tyne and Mr. James C. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Washington and Mr. Edwin A. Price for the respondent.

Gordon Campbell,
Petitioner,
590 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene C. Campbell and Mr. James E. Fenton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. John S. Pratt for the respondent.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez,
Petitioners,
591 vs.
S.B. McNeeley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Brunini for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hugh Tullis and Mr. L. T. Kennedy for the respondent.

H. L. Eveland et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
592 vs.
Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Byron S. Payne and Mr. Samuel Herrick for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. K. Gardner for the respondent.

Ford Hydro-Electric Company,
Petitioner,
593 vs.
Janet Neeley et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of

George S. Kunihiro,
Petitioner,
594 vs.
M. O. Coggins Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Waldo for the petitioner.

George S. Kunihiro,
Petitioner,
595 vs.
The Lyon Brothers Company, Arthur Miller et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Waldo for the petitioner.

Sioux City Bridge Company,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
Walter E. Miller, as County Treasurer of Dakota County, Nebraska, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. Richard L. Kennedy for the petitioner, and by Mr. John J. McCarthy for the respondents.

The Celluloid Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Larocque for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jay R. Benton and Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the respondent.

Aaron T. Bliss, Clerk of Midland County, et al., Petitioners,
599 vs.
James C. Graves et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert A. Curry for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank A. Rockwith for the respondents.

Central National Bank of Marietta, Ohio, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
600 vs.
Commodore D. Dodson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton and Mr. Edward B. Follett for the petitioner.

Aetna Insurance Company et al., Petitioners,
601 vs.
Ben C. Hyde, Superintendent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Robert J. Folonie, Mr. William S. Hogsett, Mr. Ashley Cockrill, and Mr. John S. Leahy for the petitioners, and by Mr. North Todd Gentry and Mr. John T. Barker for the respondent.

Warren O. Watson, Trustee in Bankruptcy et al., Petitioners.
602 vs.
J. Hall LeBlanc, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Loret for the petitioners.

Sinclair Refining Company et al., Petitioners,
603 vs.
Alonzo Smith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Walne, Mr. Maco Stewart, and Mr. Albert J. De Lange for the petitioners, and by Mr. George A. Hill, Jr., for the respondents.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
604 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. Ralph H. Hallett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis R. Stark and Mr. Paul R. Leah for the

N. and G. Taylor Company, Inc., Petitioner,
605 vs.
John A. Anderson et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., and Mr. Robert W. Childs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hobart P. Young for the respondents.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
607 vs.
Loi Hoa.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring for the petitioner.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Lam Young, for and on behalf of Phuong Con.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring for the petitioner.

Daniel V. Harkin et al., etc., Petitioners,
609 vs.
Edward J. Brundage, Receiver etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lloyd C. Whitman and Mr. Bernhardt Frank for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ralph F. Potter, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Henry Jackson Darby for the respondents.

Galveston Dry Dock and Construction Company, Petitioner,
610 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maco Stewart, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

John E. Wagner, Petitioner,
611 vs.
Netherlands American Steam Navigation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Graham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. Everett Masten for the respondent.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
612 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanleigh P. Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Luther Walker, Petitioner,
613 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Kennerly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Piedmont Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
James Edgar Hustead et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Ohio County of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Reed, Mr. Samuel McClay, Mr. George Poffenbarger, and Mr. Frank W. Nesbitt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles McCamic and Mr. James Morgan Clarke for the respondents.

Frank K. Bowers, as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Petitioner,
615 vs.
Walter E. Frew et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Abram J. Rose, Mr. Alfred C. Petti, and Mr. Philip M. Brett for the respondents.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President Operating the Lehigh Valley Railroad, Petitioner,
621 vs.
New York and New Jersey Transportation Company and John Mosk.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Ryan, Mr. Evan Shelby, and Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioners, and by Mr. Pierre M. Brown and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the respondents.

Charles H. Graves,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
Frank W. Brunskill, Chief of Police of the City of Minneapolis, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. James E. Markham for the respondents.

The Kansas Flour Mills Company, Petitioner, 624 vs. The Farmers National Bank of Burlington, Kansas et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Noftzger for the petitioner.
The Larabee Flour Mills Corporation, Petitioner, 625 vs. The First National Bank of Henryetta, Oklahoma et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Noftzger for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. B. F. Hummer for the respondents.
Colonial Transportation Company, Ltd., Petitioner, 628 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard H. Long for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Arthur W. Henderson for the respondent.
John Moore, Administrator of the Estate of Earl H. Moore, deceased, Petitioner, 629 vs. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel O. Hastings for the petitioner.
Mrs. Louisa B. McNeely, Administratrix of the Estate of S. B. McNeely, deceased, Petitioner, 637 vs. The Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Tullis and Mr. L. T. Kennedy for the petitioner.

E. A. Edenfield,
Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent this case was passed.

Wade Johnson,
Plaintiff in error,
156 vs.
The State of Georgia.

Garrett Benford,
Plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
The State of Georgia.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. William O. Cooper for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Wade Johnson,
Plaintiff in error,
156 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jarrett Benford,
Plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ned Harvey,
Plaintiff in error,
247 vs.
The States of Louisiana.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Paul A. Sompayrac for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Ned Harvey,
Plaintiff in error,
247 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company and Pan American Petroleum Company,
Petitioners,
305 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Frank J. Hogan in that behalf, four hours were allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument was commenced by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Frederic R. Kellogg for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Roscoe H. Brunstetter, Esquire, and William Z. Luther, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Dutton, It is ordered that Urban E. Wild, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf of Mr. J. Harry Covington, It is ordered that James R. Deering, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Lee Popham,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to defer consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari until October 25th, and for leave to file supplementary petition and brief in order to bring into the record proceedings in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals subsequent to rendition of the judgment sought to be reviewed by original petition filed herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius C. Martin for the petitioner.

International Stevedoring Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
R. Haverty.

On motion of Mr. Samuel B. Bassett in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of Arthur E. Griffin, George F. Vanderveer, and Samuel B. Bassett as amici curiae.

Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company et al., Petitioners,
305 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederic R. Kellogg for the petitioners, by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent, by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioners. On motion of Mr. Frank J. Hogan in that behalf, leave was granted to file additional brief for the petitioners.

International Stevedoring Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
R. Haverty.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that Eugene M. O'Neill, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that John M. Kinkel, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Preston Shealey, It is ordered that Foster H. Brown, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

International Stevedoring Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
R. Haverty.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark M. Litchman for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the petitioner.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
230 vs.
Terry and Tench Company Inc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. C. Aiken for the petitioner, and by Mr. William W. Dimmick for the respondents.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
239 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company,
Petitioner,
170 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. A. Carmichael for the petitioner. The case was passed temporarily.

Tyson and Brother, United Theatre Ticket Offices, Inc.,
Appellant,
261 vs.
Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York, State of New York et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Miss Grace E. Smith, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Fred W. Morrison, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. F. Anderson, It is ordered that E. J. Walsh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Rush Meadows,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. George Roscoe Davis in that behalf, the consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was deferred until October 15, with leave to counsel for petitioner to file brief on or before that day.

Tyson and Brother—United Theatre Ticket Offices, Inc.,
Appellant,
261 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. F. C. Benvenga for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellant.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company,
Petitioner,
170 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. A. Carmichael for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. James E. Markham for the respondent.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
250 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

August Dorchy,
Plaintiff in error,
119 vs.
The State of Kansas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John F. McCarron for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. John G. Egan and Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John F. McCarron for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Neil M. Cronin, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Baldwin, It is ordered that John S. Coke, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Heisterman, It is ordered that Wm. F. Hannan, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company, Limited, Inc., Petitioner,
550 vs.
Gabriela Andrea de Coster.

On motion of Mr. Chester I. Long in that behalf, leave was granted to file an additional brief for the respondent.

Fidelity National Bank and Trust Company of Kansas City et al., Appellants, vs. Felix H. Swope and Gertrude M. Brown.

46

This cause was reargued by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock for the appellants, and by Mr. Elliott H. Jones for the appellees.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. William P. Brims, Stanley Muszalski, B. J. G. Wittman et al.

212

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Maitland Beattie for the respondents, and submitted by Mr. Robert W. Childs and Mr. Albert Fink for Von Platen and Dick Company, Chicago Sash, Door and Blind Manufacturing Company, Melrose Mill Company, William Morris and Sons Company, Union Interior Finish Company, Philip Rinn Company, James A. Dick, Ewald Dierssen, Louis Haring, and H. D. Traeger, millmen, defendants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adolph L. Weil, It is ordered that John O'Gara, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Raymond Fellows, Esquire, of Bangor, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Crabbe, It is ordered that Charles S. Younger, Esquire, of Celina, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Egan, It is ordered that John B. Dillon, Esquire, of Bridgeport, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier, It is ordered that Charles Jonas Eisler, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that Charles W. Appleton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Orvel Jay Johnson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that William John Waguespack, Jr., Esquire, and Herbert W. Kaiser, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Harry Covington, It is ordered that R. A. Nestos, Esquire, of Minot, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Howard A. Couse, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6 Original. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant, The
United States of America, Intervener.

ORDER ANNOUNCING CONCLUSIONS.

"On counterclaim filed by the State of Texas with reference to the location of that portion of the boundary line extending northwardly along the 100th meridian from the Red River to the parallel of 36 degrees, 30 minutes, north latitude, which constitutes the eastern boundary of the Panhandle of Texas and the main western boundary of Oklahoma.

Conclusions: Neither the Jones, Brown and Clark line, nor a line running north from the Kidder monument, has been established as the boundary line; the boundary is the line of the true 100th meridian extending north from its intersection with the south bank of the South Fork of Red River to its intersection with the parallel of 36 degrees, 30 minutes; and this line should now be accurately located and marked by a Commissioner or Commissioners appointed by the Court, whose report shall be subject to its approval. The parties may submit within thirty days the form of a decree to carry these conclusions into effect."

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
127 vs.
The Chemical Foundation,
Incorporated.

: Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by eliminating the direction for judgment against the United States for costs; and as so modified is affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
127 vs.
The Chemical Foundation,
Incorporated.

ON petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Charles H. Spear, M. F. Cochrane and G. B. Sanford, Constituting the Board of State Harbor Commissioners of the State of California,
Plaintiffs in error,
327 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Rossi, Silvio Di Santo and Charles Carr, Plaintiffs in error,
86 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and on motion to transfer, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in accordance with the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dan Bartoncini,
Plaintiff in error,
194 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, at the relation to and use of Wabash Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
69 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

On consideration of the motion of David W. Peters, Esquire, on behalf of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for leave to file a brief as amicus curiae in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence H. Myers,
65 vs.
Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and The Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion of the State of Michigan for leave to file an amended bill of complaint making the State of New York a joint complainant herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the State of New York be, and is hereby, granted leave to file a separate bill of complaint on its own behalf conforming in other respects to the amended bill of complaint tendered with said motion; such separate bill to be filed next Monday.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate Tendler,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Morris Tendler.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate Tendler,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Morris Tendler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re Disbarment of John H. Adriaans.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the order herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Josephine Stipcich,
533 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel J. Hart,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
H. B. North, A. E. Fisher and A. V. Essington.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel J. Hart,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
H. B. North, A. E. Fisher and A. V. Essington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Goldman,
Plaintiff in error,
248 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Goldman,

Plaintiff in error,

248 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

467 vs.

Sherman D. Hill, Administrator.

A suggestion of diminution of the record and a motion for writ of certiorari to correct the record having been made,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Thomson,

Plaintiff in error,

103 vs.

Alexander W. Thomson and Roderick W. McKinnon et al., copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Thomson and McKinnon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Canal-Commercial Trust and Savings
Bank and Union Indemnity Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
524 vs.
Earl Brewer.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Canal-Commercial Trust and Savings
Bank and Union Indemnity Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
524 vs.
Earl Brewer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel Jones,
Plaintiff in error,
630 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel Jones, Plaintiff in error,
630 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
657 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David F. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
657 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Stewart & Company,
Plaintiff in error,
290 vs.
Dominick Rivara.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas H. Larkin,
Plaintiff in error,
652 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas H. Larkin,
Plaintiff in error,
652 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lee Popham,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to defer consideration of the original petition for certiorari and for leave to file supplementary petition for certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Board of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
230 vs.
Terry and Tench Company, Inc., and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Petitioner,
366 vs.
New York and Albany Lighterage Company.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Petitioner,
367 vs.
Lloyd W. Seaman.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Petitioner,
368 vs.
Thomas Staples Fuller.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
395 vs.
Solomon Novack.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York, Ontario, and Western Railway Company,
Appellant,
554 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. L. Smith, Sr., et al.,
Appellant,
548 vs.
Louis J. Wilson et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hector M. Zahn and A. W. Ross,
Plaintiffs in error,
196 vs.
Board of Public Works of the City of Los Angeles et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles B. Beery,
Plaintiff in error,
232 vs.
James G. Houghton, as Inspector of Buildings for the City of Minneapolis.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
439 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Philadelphia ex relatione, Daniel J. Furey, Taxpayer et al., Appellants, vs. Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company et al.

515

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

362

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray C. Simmons, Petitioner, vs. Edward P. Swan.

377

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Hammond, Petitioner, vs. Schappi Bus Line, Inc.

385

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Hammond,
Petitioner,
386 vs.
Farina Bus Line and Transportation Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mercantile Trust Company of St. Louis, Missouri,
Petitioner,
387 vs.
Wilmot Road District.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of the United States, etc., Petitioner,
394 vs.
Electric Reduction Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
409 vs.
Arkansas Land and Lumber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. B. Leach and Company, Inc., Petitioner,
436 vs.
Walter Peirson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rothschild Francis, Petitioner,
371 vs.
George Washington Williams, Judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pulitzer Publishing Company,
Petitioner,
374 vs.
Houston Printing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
376 vs.
H. K. Wellborn and J. A. Walls, under the firm name of Wellborn and Walls.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
379 vs.
T. A. Binford, Sheriff of Harris County, Texas et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. George Edgeley et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

380

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Hart, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

382

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Town of Flagstaff, Petitioner, vs. William D. Walsh, as the surviving partner of the co-partnership of McLean and Walsh etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

383

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Smelting and Refining Company, Petitioner, vs. George Campbell Carson. 384

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sylvia Lake Company, Inc., Dominion Company of New York, J. Herman McLean et al., Petitioners, vs. Northern Ore Company, New York Zinc Company, Inc., Henry W. Borst et al. 389

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Warren Landers. 390

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
392 vs.
Clinton Harris.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, substituted for H. Bergman, Master of the Steamship "Henry County,"
Petitioner,
396 vs.
A cargo of about 3253 tons of coal laden on board the Steamship "Henry County" etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, substituted for Martin Miller, Master of the Steamship "Franklin County",
Petitioner,
397 vs.
A cargo of about 3248 tons of coal laden on board the Steamship "Franklin County", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

N. B. Josey Guano Company and N. B. Josey Company, Farmers Cotton Oil Company et al., Petitioners,
399 vs.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. L. Margulies and Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
J. Raymond McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
A. H. Phillips, Tax Collector for Webster Parish, Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
A. H. Phillips, Tax Collector for Webster Parish, Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana,
Petitioner,
403 vs.
M. H. Sandlin, Tax Assessor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. McIntosh, Comptroller of the Currency, E. F. Anderson, Receiver, Georgia National Bank et al.,
Petitioners,
404 vs.
Miss Ruth M. Jackson and Mrs. Anna M. Scott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Horowitz and S. Abramson,
Petitioners,
405 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maurice R. Shaw, Owner of
The Derrick Barge, "Holly,"
Petitioner,
407 vs.
Western Assurance Company of
Toronto, Canada.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
408 vs.
John B. Semple and Company, a former Pennsylvania Corporation, by its Directors, John B. Semple et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Steamship Lines, Inc., and Northern Trust Company, Petitioners,
410 vs.
United States Lloyds, Incorporated, Globe and Rutgers Fire Insurance Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace Henry and Mae Henry,
Petitioners,
411 vs.
Olive Henry et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Barusch,

Petitioner,

413 vs.

G. W. Brainard, as Trustee of Charles H. Durel et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Cigar Stores Company of America, Petitioner,

415 vs.

Edward R. Rayher, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bertrand Barnett, trading as Culver and Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. F. Trappey et al., trading as B. F. Trappey & Sons, Petitioners,

419 vs.

McIlhenny Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Weinstein,
Petitioner,
420 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Chain Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
423 vs.
Chester N. Weaver, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Franklin D'Olier, Burton Etherington,
James D'Olier, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
425 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eugene Bergron, Myer Byne, Sven Swenson et al., Petitioners,
426 vs.
Ernest G. Hellsten, as bailee of the owner, Pere Marquette Lines Steamer, claimant of the American Vessel "Nevada", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius Kessler and Company, Inc., Petitioner,
427 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company and A. D. Dickinson, Petitioners,
428 vs.
Cora Seirer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl B. Anderson,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Bovard,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. Jones,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mord Carter,

Petitioner,

433 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony A. Scheib,

Petitioner,

434 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret Collins, Administratrix ad prosequendum of the Estate of Martin Collins, deceased,

Petitioner,

435 vs.

Erie Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delia Salzer,

Plaintiff in error,

25 vs

The United States of America,
Treasury Department, Bureau of
War Risk Insurance.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, counsel for the defendants in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in accordance with a stipulation of counsel filed herein,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delia Salzer,

Plaintiff in error,

25 vs.

The United States of America,
Treasury Department, Bureau of
War Risk Insurance.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

642 vs.

Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against
The American Loan and Trust
Company, Administrator, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief on behalf of the United States in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, on or before Friday next.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
381 vs.
The Texas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company and National Surety Company, Petitioners,
483 vs.
The Texas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al., Petitioners,
217 vs.
Attleboro Steam and Electric Company.

On motion of Mr. Charles F. Consaul in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Southern Sierras Power Company as amicus curiae.

William C. Amos, Petitioner,
643 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to print certain portions of the record, or in the alternative, for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert Mae Williams, in behalf of Mr. Walter S. Hilborn for the petitioner.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, et al., Appellants, vs. Ambler Realty Company. 31

On motion of Mr. Alfred Bettman in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the National Conference of City Planning et al., as amici curiae.

Reba Fenwick, Plaintiff in error, vs. Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting Attorney, Darke County, Ohio. 26

This cause was passed on motion of Mr. Charles S. Moore in behalf of counsel.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 589

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Gardiner P. Lloyd, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Rosenberg Brothers and Company. 617

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, Mr. Frederick H. Conway, and Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., and Mr. Farnum P. Griffith for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. California Wine Association. 618

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, Mr. Frederick H. Conway, and Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., and Mr. Farnum P. Griffith for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
619 vs.
S. L. Jones and Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Arthur M. Boal, Mr. Frederick R. Conway, and Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Marmon, Jr., and Mr. Farnum P. Griffith for the respondent.

Alexander Ackerson, Petitioner,
622 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Ackerson pro se.

Paul M. Ashbaugh, Petitioner,
632 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Barry and Mr. Paul M. Ashbaugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Paradon Engineering Company, Inc., Petitioner,
636 vs.
Electro Bleaching Gas Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. P. Warfield and Mr. C. A. L. Massie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. Loren M. Wood for the respondents.

Addison Miller, Security Storage Company et al., Petitioners,
640 vs.
City of St. Paul.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Douglas for the petitioners, and by Mr. Morton Barrows, Mr. Arthur A. Stewart, and Mr. Eugene M. O'Neill for the respondent.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
642 vs.
Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against The American Loan and Trust Company, Administrator of the Estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Canfield, Mr. W. A. White, and Mr. Sidney T. Miller for the petitioner.

William C. Amos,
Petitioner,
643 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter S. Hilborn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Clark Motor Company,
Appellant,
286 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

The resignation of W. Stanley Smith was suggested and the motion to substitute Olaf Johnson, present Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin, as the party appellee herein, was granted, on motion of Mr. Hartwell Cabell in behalf of Mr. Duane R. Dills for the appellant.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
287 vs.
W. Stanley Smith, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

The resignation of W. Stanley Smith was suggested and the motion to substitute Olaf Johnson, present Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin, as the party appellee herein, was granted, on motion of Mr. Hartwell Cabell in behalf of Mr. Duane R. Dills for the appellant.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,
Appellant,
255 vs.
Harry L. Conn, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.
Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
287 vs.
Olaf Johnson, as Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.
Clark Motor Company,
Appellant,
286 vs.
Olaf Johnson, as Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.
Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
273 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.
Utterbach-Gleason Company,
Appellant,
274 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

Three hours allowed for the argument of these cases on motion of Mr. Hartwell Cabell in that behalf. Argument commenced by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the appellant in No. 255, continued by Mr. C. S. Younger for the appellee in No. 255; by Mr. T. L. McIntosh for the appellee in Nos. 286 and 287; by Mr. Raymond Fellows for the appellee in Nos. 273 and 274, and concluded by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the appellants in Nos. 273, 274, 286 and 287.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al.,
Petitioners,
217 vs.
Attleboro Steam and Electric Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. W. Boyden for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jay R. Benton It is ordered that Lewis Goldberg, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, It is ordered that John Daly Cofer, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that Thomas W. Payne, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Strasburger, It is ordered that Joseph Silverstein, Esquire, of Asbury Park, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Samuel Edwin Murrell, Esquire, of Sarasota, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Broussard, It is ordered that Edward R. Schowalter, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, It is ordered that Henry E. Schmidt, Esquire, and Joseph W. Wiley, Esquire, of Bakersfield, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States,

Petitioner,

470 vs.

Curtis and Company Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island et al.,

Petitioners,

217 vs.

Attleboro Steam and Electric Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Arthur M. Allen for the petitioners.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, and Harry W. Stein, Inspector of Buildings for the Village of Euclid, Appellants,
31 vs.
Ambler Realty Company.

This cause was reargued by Mr. James Metzenbaum for the appellants, and by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the appellee.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg et al., Petitioners,
224 vs.
Charles Franklin Humphrey.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Amos J. Peaslee for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Grant and Mr. William P. Hubbard for the respondent.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon, Appellant,
185 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland et al.

This cause was argued by Miss Grace E. Smith for the appellant, and by Mr. John S. Coke for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mart H. Royston, It is ordered that C. B. Cochran, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard E. Wellford, It is ordered that William H. Labofish, Esquire, and Gregory Cipriani, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Doras Hebert, Alcee Benoit, John Miller, and Clobule Arabie,
Plaintiffs in error,
24 vs.
State of Louisiana.

This cause was submitted by Mr. A. R. Mitchell for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. E. R. Schowalter, and Mr. John J. Robira for the defendant in error.

The Massachusetts State Grange et al., Appellants,
296 vs.
Jay R. Benton, as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank W. Morrison for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America, Appellant,
113 vs.
General Electric Company, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company and Westinghouse Lamp Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant; continued by Mr. Charles Neave for the General Electric Company, and concluded by Mr. Fred H. Wood for the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company and Westinghouse Lamp Company.

D. H. Brasfield, Mark Williver, and William Barion, Petitioners,
243 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent, and case submitted by Mr. John W. Preston for the petitioners.

Cologero Pasulo, Petitioner,
251 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John O'Gara for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Cologero Pasulo,
Petitioner,
251 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John O'Gara for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Arnold H. Brein,
Plaintiff in error,
253 vs.
State Department of Health et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John B. Dillon for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. William E. Egan for the defendants in error, by Mr. Frank E. Healy for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. John B. Dillon for the plaintiff in error.

General Petroleum Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
177 vs.
County of Kern.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. L. Weil for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.-

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Otis L. Mohundro, Esquire, of Calvert City, State of Kentucky, and Herbert J. S. Devries, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, It is ordered that Charles Edward Wainwright, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Hugh R. Francis, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Townsend, It is ordered that Nelson Littell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that E. A. Perkins, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roland Boynton, It is ordered that Ray H. Calihan, Esquire, of Garden City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel F. Moran, It is ordered that John D. Monroe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Fenwick, It is ordered that Philip S. Moyer, Esquire, and E. LeRoy Keen, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allen McCarty, It is ordered that William DeForest Manice, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James E. Markham, It is ordered that Gilbert E. Harris, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Russell C. Rosenquest, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Silo Gottlieb, It is ordered that Samuel Rosenberg, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard F. Garvey, It is ordered that Joseph Blue McDonough, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert A. Jones, It is ordered that Louis H. Grieb, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Pauline G. Wallace, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Walter F. Miller, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Harry H. Peterson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Emmitt J. McDaniel, Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Selby, It is ordered that Henry W. Morgan, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, It is ordered that Harold M. Wilson, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Napier, It is ordered that Fred L. Warner, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

International Stevedoring Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
R. Haverty.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Alexander Ackerson,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Ackerson,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Petroleum Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
177 vs.
County of Kern.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold H. Brein,
Plaintiff in error,
253 vs.
State Department of Health et al.

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace M. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, William B. Lymer, Attorney General, etc., et al., Petitioners,
465 vs.
T. Tokushige et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receivers of the Wabash Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company, Petitioners,
482 vs.
George J. Gould, Kingdon Gould et al., as Executors etc.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Paul Yaselli, Petitioner,
497 vs.
Guy D. Goff.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. W. Bliss Company,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rush Meadows,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Gertrude S. Ponder,
Petitioner,
438 vs.
Lamar Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
440 vs.
Steamtug "Cutchogue" her engines, etc., Long Island Railroad Company, Claimant.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irvin McD. Garfield, as Receiver of B. B. and R. Knight, Inc.,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
The Mallory Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. A. Kemp, T. B. Noble, I. H. Roberts et al., Petitioners,
442 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Max Hart,

Petitioner,

445 vs.

B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange, Orpheum Circuit, Inc., Excelsior Collection Agency et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Hart,

Petitioner,

446 vs.

B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange, Orpheum Circuit, Inc., Excelsior Collection Agency et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. D. Guggenheim, M. Guggenheim, L. Guggenheim, et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

449 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Menaregidis, in behalf of
Andreas Menaregidis,
Petitioner,
455 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of
Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Soticuros Christoulas, also known
as Christ Lawyer,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of
Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Pawling and Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Gay,

Petitioner,

458 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Russell Gay,

Petitioner,

459 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Washer, alias Harry The Jew,

Petitioner,

460 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. M. Albury,
Petitioner,
461 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Thompson and The J. L. Hudson Company, doing business etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
462 vs.
The Vogue Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Belvin and John McGowan,
Petitioners,
463 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
Cripple Creek and Colorado Springs
Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
464 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob P. Teter,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon and California Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
468 vs.
Andrew B. Hammond and Charles J.
Winton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon and California Railroad Company, Petitioner,
469 vs.
Booth-Kelly Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. J. McInnes, Receiver of the Citizens National Bank of Roswell, N. M., Petitioner,
471 vs.
The American Surety Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Federal Agent, Petitioner,
473 vs.
W. M. Grantham.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Howard P. Converse and Edwin P. Bliss,
trading as Converse and Company, Petitioners,
474 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eric Lange and A. H. Bergstrom,
Copartners trading as Lange and Bergstrom, Petitioners,
475 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary D. A. Sayles, Charles O. Read and James R. MacColl, individually etc., Petitioners,
476 vs.
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York and Frederick K. Rupprecht.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joshua Russell,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merle B. Copeland,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren E. Barnett,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
480 vs.
Ernest R. Gubler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Earl B. Barnes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Thomas H. Cowley, Paul E. Brady et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
481 vs.
William Schatzkin et al., etc., and Lawrence J. Hirsch et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milton F. Webster,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
Joseph T. Terry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacinto Moss, Pedro L. Moss, Pedro J. Moss, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
486 vs.
John H. Sherburne and Howard Stockton, Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Village of Terrace Park,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
Russell Errett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Carelli,

Petitioner,

489 vs.

The State of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lena B. McKee and Fred McKee,
Trustees, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

490 vs.

Cuno H. Rudolph, James F. Oyster and J. Franklin Bell, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Universal Rim Company,

Petitioner,

491 vs.

Firestone Tire and Rubber Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Standard Electric Stove Company,
Petitioner,
493 vs.
The Toledo, St. Louis and Western Railroad.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
496 vs.
Eunice Pearson, Administratrix of the Estate of J. L. Pearson, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Helen L. Givens, Petitioner,
498 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
505 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,

Petitioner,

506 vs.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Bank,

Petitioner,

508 vs.

Philip Applebaum.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Submarine Signal Company,

Petitioner,

510 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
537 vs.
Samuel Gettinger et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
95 vs.
George A. Storrs et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker in behalf of Mr. Dan B. Shields, Mr. Mahlon E. Wilson, and Mr. Albert R. Barnes for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,
Appellant,
87 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Fred L. Warner in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Michigan as amicus curiae in this cause.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
695 vs.
The Bronx Gas and Electric Company.

Mr. William L. Ransom, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of New York.

I, Alexander Gilchrist, Jr., Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, do hereby, certify:

That, in a certain cause pending in the said court, Equity No. 26-371, wherein the Bronx Gas and Electric Company was plaintiff, and William A. Prendergast, William R. Pooley, Charles Van Voorhis, Oliver C. Semple and James A. Parsons, constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, and Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, were defendants, a final decree, dated the 31st day of July, 1924, and signed

by the Honorable Francis A. Winslow, U. S. D. J., was duly rendered, in favor of the said plaintiff, and against the said defendants, wherein and whereby, among other things, a certain maximum rate of $1.00 per thousand cubic feet of gas sold by the plaintiff, and $1.15 per thousand cubic feet of gas sold by the plaintiff, and a certain standard of gas of not less than 650 British thermal units per cubic foot, and certain provisions of Chapters 898 and 899 of the Laws of 1923 of the State of New York, relative to such rates and such standard of gas, were adjudged and decreed to be illegal and void, because in contravention of Section 10 of Article I, and of the Fourteenth Amendment, of the Constitution of the United States, and wherein and whereby the said defendants were enjoined, among other things, from enforcing the said rates and standard of gas and the said provisions of the said statutes, all as more fully appears in the said final decree.

That on the 29th day of October, 1924, the said Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, filed herein a petition dated October 7, 1924, for leave to appeal from the said final decree rendered on the 31st day of July, 1924, for the reasons set forth in an Assignment of Error therewith filed;

That on the 29th day of October, 1924, the said appeal was duly allowed by Honorable Francis A. Winslow, U. S. D. J.;

That on the 29th day of October, 1924, an order was duly entered herein severing the defendants William A. Prendergast, William R. Pooley, Charles Van Voorhis, Oliver C. Semple and James A. Parsons, constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, as parties to the said action and for the purpose of the appeal so taken from the said final decree;

That on the 30th day of October, 1924, a citation on the said appeal was duly issued out of the said District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York to the New York and Queens Gas Company returnable at a Term of the Supreme Court of the United States to be held in the City of Washington, D. C., on the 30th day of November, 1924;

That on the 14th day of November, 1924, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause extending the time for the appellant to serve a praecipe and to docket this case in the Supreme Court of the United States, and file a transcript of the record thereof with the Clerk of that Court on appeal from the decree entered herein on the 31st day of July, 1924, be extended to and including sixty days after the date of filing of the mandate of the United States Supreme Court with the Clerk of this court

on the appeal taken by this appellant from a similar decree entered on July 11, 1924, in the case of the New York & Queens Gas Company v. Prendergast, et al. (E-26-367);

That on January 9, 1925, an order was duly made and entered in the said cause substituting George R. Van Namee in place of James A. Parsons as party defendant, and substituting Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, in place of Carl Sherman, as Attorney General of the State of New York, as party defendant.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the said District Court, at the City of New York, in the State of New York, this 15th day of October, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and twenty-six, and of the Independence of the said United States the One Hundred and Fifty-first.

(Seal) (Signed) Alex. Gilchrist, Jr.,
Clerk."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
No. -- Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the complainant, the bill of complaint was filed in this cause pursuant to the order of October 11, 1926, and process ordered to issue returnable on Monday, November 1, 1926.

Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,

Appellant,

11 vs.

The United States.

The Firm of M. Jebsen, Corresponding Owner of the Steamship Carl Diederichsen, etc.,

Appellant,

12 vs.

The United States.

Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company,

Appellant,

13 vs.

The United States.

Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company,

Appellant,

14 vs.

The United States.

Atlas Line Steamship Company,

Appellant,

15 vs.

The United States.

Atlas Line Steamship Company,

Appellant,

16 vs.

The United States.

North German Lloyd,

Appellant,

17 vs.

The United States.

North German Lloyd,

Appellant,

18 vs.

The United States.

On motion of Mr. Charles H. LeFevre in that behalf, these cases were passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1926 - CONTINUED.

North German Lloyd,
Appellant,
19 vs.
The United States.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt,
Aktien-Gesellschaft, etc.,
Appellant,
21 vs.
The United States.

Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs-
Gesellschaft, Appellant,
23 vs.
The United States.

Hamburg-Amerikanische
Pafetfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, etc.,
Appellant,
20 vs.
The United States.

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
238 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file supplemental brief for the plaintiff in error on or before Friday next.

The United States,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
Stone and Downer Company et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Sharretts for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Caron Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
Henri Muracour et Cie.

On motion of Mr. William L. Symons in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the V. Vivaudou, incorporated, as amicus curiae in this cause.

Joseph Buchholder et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
265 vs.
Frank Solomon.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Leberman for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John T. Bottom for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

M. Hartley Dodge,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Minnie E. Allison et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McCarter and Mr. John A. Garver for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jacob L. Newman for the respondents.

George H. Jennings and Creekmore Wallace, Petitioners,
641 vs.
Lonzetta Canady and Mountain State Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Blakney and Mr. Creekmore Wallace for the petitioners.

Caron Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
Henri Muracur et Cie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice Leon and Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Offutt for the respondent.

Knickerbocker Merchandising Company, (Inc.) et al.,
Petitioners,
650 vs.
United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

T. E. McLendon,
Petitioner,
651 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan and Mr. J. M. Grimmet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. A. S. Lanier and Mr. A. W. Henderson for the respondent.

Sam Nelson,
Plaintiff in error,
143 vs.
The People of the State of California.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Benson Landon and Mr. Leon Hornstein for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the plaintiff in error.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
357 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
358 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
365 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

Four hours allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, It is ordered that Lester A. Jaffe, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be, admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nye F. Morehouse, It is ordered that Samuel H. Cady, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders ofthe Court:

Henry Albrecht et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
9 vs.
The United States of America.

A. J. Byars,
Petitioner,
72 vs.
The United States of America.

Wong Tai, etc.,

Plaintiff in error,

79 vs.

The United States of America.

Enrique Collado,

Appellant,

81 vs.

Manuel Nater Girona, Marshal, etc.

John E. McGuire,

85 vs.

The United States of America.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

95 vs.

George A. Storrs et al.

John Carlton Dysart,

Petitioner,

102 vs.

The United States of America.

The United States of America ex rel.

Emanuel Vajtauer,

Appellant,

111 vs.

Commissioner of Immigration of the

Port of New York.

William Burns,

Plaintiff in error,

135 vs.

The United States of America.

Elmer C. Potter, Prohibition Director,

etc., Appellant,

145 vs.

James Geraghty.

Thomas Murphy et al.,

443 vs.

The United States of America.

R. Burney Long,

Plaintiff in error,

472 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

Frederick L. Miller,

Plaintiff in error,

512 vs.

The State of Oregon.

Ed Tumey, Plaintiff in error,

527 vs.

The State of Ohio.

United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

537 vs.

Samuel Gettinger, etc.

C. Dewey Brian et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

553 vs.

The United States of America.

Mrs. Bill Breaux,

Plaintiff in error,

561 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

Paul Schmolke, Plaintiff in error,

647 vs.

Daniel J. O'Brien, Chief of Police.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, November 22, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Byron Dunn et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

644 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

George R. Dale,
Plaintiff in error,
656 vs.
The State of Indiana.

S. F. Larsen, Plaintiff in error,
658 vs.
The State of Texas.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, January 10, 1927.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
357 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
358 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
365 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant; by Mr. John A. Garver and Mr. William L. Ransom for the Consolidated Gas Company of New York, appellee in No. 357; by Mr. William N. Dykman for the Brooklyn Union Gas Company, appellee in No. 358; by Mr. Samuel F. Moran for Kings County Lighting Company, appellee in No. 365, and concluded by Mr. John Holley Clark, Jr., for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile, No. 4,776,501, etc.

Port Gardner Investment Company,
173 vs.
The United States of America.

The re-argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Duane H. Dills for the respondent in No. 115 and for the Port Gardner Investment Company in No. 173.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that Charles V. Falkenberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Thomas J. Duffy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert H. Putney, It is ordered that Chauncey W. Reed, Esquire, of Naperville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
9 Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The proposed form of decree of the defendant, The State of Wisconsin, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Rieser for the defendant.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
One Ford Coupe Automobile No. 4,776,501, etc.
Port Gardner Investment Company,
173 vs.
The United States of America.

The reargument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner in No. 115 and for the United States in No. 173, and concluded by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the respondent in No. 115, and for the Port Gardner Investment Company in No. 173.

Stella Van Oster,
Plaintiff in error,
303 vs.
The State of Kansas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Roland Boynton for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William H. Thompson for the plaintiff in error.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,
Appellant,
87 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.
Chicago and North Western Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
310 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
311 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas Stevenson for the appellant in No. 87; continued by Mr. R. C. Alston for the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, appellee in No. 87; by Mr. Nye F. Morehouse for the plaintiff in error in No. 310; by Mr. R. M. Bleser for the defendant in error in Nos. 310 and 311; and by Mr. Thomas Stevenson for the appellant in No. 87.

Proclamation being made the court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Chauncey T. Eldridge, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Anderson, It is ordered that Edward J. Cunningham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,
Appellant,
87 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.
Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
310 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

(and)

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Thomas Stevenson for the appellant in No. 87; and concluded by Mr. Nye F. Morehouse for the plaintiff in error in No. 310, and submitted by Mr. H. H. Field and Mr. C. S. Jefferson for the plaintiff in error in No. 311.

Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
311 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
238 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Arthur P. Mullen for the plaintiff in error; by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin I. Salinger for the plaintiff in error.

Charles H. Graves,
Plaintiff in error,
320 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Russell C. Rosenquest for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
266 vs.
James W. McElvain et al.

This cause was submitted by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Sewall Key for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John J. Healy for the defendant in error.

C. A. Hudson and R. R. Brogan,
Petitioners,
307 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Dunn for the respondent, and submitted by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the petitioner.

S. Rose, Plaintiff in error,
77 vs.
U. S. Webb, Attorney General of the State of California; Frank English, Deputy Attorney General etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute the writ of error, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
108 vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Hardin, It is ordered that Selim A. Gallier, Esquire, of East Orange, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Thomas M. Phillips, Esquire, of Lakeland, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Sherman B. Randall, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector,

Petitioner,

108 vs.

The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Shocen, It is ordered that Edward I. Barry, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Frank L. Horton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Hanson Boyden, It is ordered that Arthur Dexter Brigham, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beller, It is ordered that M. P. Trimble, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, It is ordered that Geo. Koffenberger, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that Wellmore B. Turner, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, It is ordered that Harold C. Faulkner, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that Charles A. Roberts, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that George C. Thorpe, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements, It is ordered that W. H. Lawrence, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Dean, It is ordered that Elmer E. Pearcy, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that Avery M. Blount, Esquire, of Searcy, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

August Dorchy,

Plaintiff in error,

119 vs.

The State of Kansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company,

Appellant,

255 vs.

Harry L. Conn, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,

Appellant,

273 vs.

Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Utterback-Gleason Company,
Appellant,
274 vs.
Wilbur D. Spencer, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Maine.

APPEAL FROM the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Clark Motor Company,
Appellant,
286 vs.
Olaf Johnson, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chrysler Sales Corporation,
Appellant,
287 vs.
Olaf Johnson, as Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and

decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Lois P. Myers, as Administratrix of
the Estate of Frank S. Myers,
deceased, Appellant,
2 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, November 1st, until Monday, November 22d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Amos,
Petitioner,
643 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to print only such portions of the record in this cause as opposing counsel shall agree is relevant to petitioner's conviction below, or in the alternative to proceed further in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Amos,
Petitioner,
643 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
95 vs.
George D. Storrs, Joseph S. Welsh et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 22nd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
Stone and Downer Company and Lowe Donald and Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Buchhalter, Max L. Rosenthal, Sam Levy et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
265 vs.
Frank Solomon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
537 vs.
Samuel Gettinger, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 22nd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Nelson,
Plaintiff in error,
143 vs.
The People of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,
Petitioner,
511 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for hearing on January 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on the issue as to the existence of authority of counsel who filed the bill to represent complainant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving partner of Howard Phelps and Charles H. Phelps, copartners, etc., Petitioner,
531 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
539 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richmond Screw Anchor Company, Inc., Petitioner,
540 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
542 vs.
Mary I. Aeby.

ORDER ALLOWING CERTIORARI.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robins Dry Dock and Repair Company, Petitioner,
546 vs.
George Flint, Samuel W. Collins and Ludwig T. Brehm, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John James Jackson et al., Petitioners,
547 vs.
Steamship "Archimedes", Lamport and Holt Line, Ltd., Claimant.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner,
552 vs.
J. H. King.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

A. W. Duckett and Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
557 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security Trust Company, Bankruptcy Receiver,
Petitioner,
513 vs.
Charles J. De Land, Receiver of the Detroit Mortgage Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Detroit United Railway,
Petitioner,
514 vs.
Alfred Leroy Craven.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph A. Horton,

Petitioner,

516 vs.

Cary A. Hardee, Governor, Ernest Amos, Comptroller, J. C. Luning, Treasurer, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Laveirge and John B. Arnold and M. B. Arnold,

Petitioners,

517 vs.

James C. Davis, as Agent of the President Under the Transportation Act.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Craig,

Petitioner,

518 vs.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Steel and Tube Company of America, Petitioner,
519 vs.
Dingess Rum Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Auburn and Alton Coal Company, Petitioner,
520 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hilda Roberts, Victor Siegel, Helen Siegel et al., Petitioners,
523 vs.
Chris Yegen, Peter Yegen and Harry L. Hanson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ross Banta,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mechanics and Metals National Bank of the City of New York,
Petitioner,
532 vs.
J. C. Buchanan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel Croker White et al.,
Petitioners,
534 vs.
Bula Croker, Individually etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. R. Grace and Company,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
The Panama Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Waxman,
Petitioner,
536 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
Hermina Bundscho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank McGarry and James McGarry,

Petitioners,

541 vs.

John J. Lentz, George W. Hoglan, John D. Karns et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Scott M. Atkin,

Petitioner,

543 vs.

Nathan H. Baier, E. H. Bartholemew, D. L. Southard et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

544 vs.

May McKinney and William Ayer McKinney, Executors of the Estate of Henry Nelson McKinney, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company, Limited, Incorporated, Petitioner,
550 vs.
Gabriela Andrea de Coster.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Arnold, Petitioner,
551 vs.
Ross A. Collins.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Toledo et al., Petitioners,
554 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. R. Grace and Company,

Petitioner,

555 vs.

Toyo Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Procter and Gamble Company and The Procter and Gamble Distributing Company,

Petitioners,

451 vs.

Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

494 vs.

The Procter and Gamble Company and The Procter and Gamble Distributing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Plaintiff in error, vs. Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Executors, etc.

88

On motion of Mr. John W. Townsend in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Isaac B. Lipson as amicus curiae, in this cause.

William M. Webb, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

703

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and that the deposit already made in this cause be refunded and petition for writ of certiorari and record be printed at public expense was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. Oscar O'Neill Touchston for the petitioner.

Los Angeles Brush Manufacturing Corporation, Petitioner, vs. William P. James, Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., on behalf of Mr. Ford W. Harris for the petitioner.

The United States of America ex rel. Julio E. Roman Checa, Petitioner, vs. George E. Williams, Criminal Sheriff, Parish of Orleans, Louisiana.

391

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. United Cigar Stores Company of America.

570

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the petitioner.

The United States,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
David H. J. Arnold, as
Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Ludlow Chrystie for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
627 vs.
George P. Miller et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Williams for the respondents.

Saturnino Lopez,
Petitioner,
631 vs.
Manuel Ernesto Gonzalez.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell for the petitioner.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
645 vs.
Gertrude Moppin, Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar W. Camp, Mr. Robert O. Brennan, and Mr. E. E. McInnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maxwell McNutt for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
653 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Wright, Mr. W. E. Kay, Mr. Thomas B. Adams, and Mr. Frank W. Swathmey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. George C. Bedell for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
654 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Wright, Mr. W. B. Kay, Mr. Thomas B. Adams, and Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. George C. Bedell for the respondents.

The National Bank of Commerce in St. Louis, Petitioner,
659 vs.
Henry Clay Pierce.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Edwards, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. W. T. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. S. Priest and Mr. John F. Green for the respondent.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
662 vs.
Edward Goodyear, as Administrator of the Estate of Lewis Goodyear, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. T. [illegible]. Littlepage, Mr. Luther Burns, Mr. J. E. Du Mars, and Mr. W. D. Vance for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
669 vs.
Leib Ritterman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. J. Kennedy White, and Mr. Harry B. Amey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes, Jr., for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
96 vs.
Western Meat Company.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Swift and Company,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Three hours allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the petitioner in No. 96, and for the respondent in No. 231; continued by Mr. Edward I. Barry for the respondent in No. 96; by Mr. James M. Sheean for the petitioner in No. 231; by Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the petitioner in Nos. 96 and 231; and by Mr. H. K. Smith for the petitioner in No. 213.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, It is ordered that Chester B. Kidd, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
96 vs.
Western Meat Company.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Swift and Company,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the respondent in No. 213, and concluded by Mr. Herbert Knox Smith for the petitioner in No. 213.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1926 - CONTINUED.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
254 vs.
International Harvester Company
et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellant, and by Mr. William S. Elliott for the appellees.

George Ford, George Harris, J. Evelyn et al.,
Petitioners,
312 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Harold C. Faulkner for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Ruth Andas Chisholm, of Oneida, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce L. Casteel, It is ordered that Salen F. Bassinger, Esquire, of Fort Lauderdale, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Houston, It is ordered that Ira J. Pettiford, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Ford, George Harris, J. Evelyn et al., Petitioners, 312 vs. The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Marion De Vries for the petitioners. On motion of Mr. Marion De Vries for the petitioners, leave was granted to file additional brief for the petitioners on or before Friday next.

Giovanni Di Santo,
Plaintiff in error,
288 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William H. Neely for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. J. H. Neely for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. E. LeRoy Keen for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Philip S. Moyer for the defendant in error.

William Earl Dodge and Joshua T. Dodge, Petitioners,
341 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Daniel T. Hagan for the petitioners, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Herman A. Uihlein et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
175 vs.
The State of Wisconsin et al., etc., et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edwin S. Mack for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Herman L. Ekern and Mr. F. E. Bump for the defendants in error.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
343 vs.
Holyoke Street Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, Jr., It is ordered that Barton Baker, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
343 vs.
The Holyoke Street Railway Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant, by Mr. David H. Keedy for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands,
Petitoner,
316 vs.
Ynchausti and Company.

On motion of Mr. L. H. Hedrick in that behalf, leave was granted to Mr. A. R. McGuire to appear and present oral argument for the petitioner pro hac vice. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. L. H. Hedrick for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. William H. Lawrence for the respondent. The Court declined to hear further argument.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1926 - CONTINUED.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself and all other Seamen etc.,

Petitioner,

306 vs.

Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. C. T. Hildridge for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Fairbanks, It is ordered that Harold M. Sawyer, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Raymond S. Taylor, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Taylor, It is ordered that Thomas M. Wilkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Vance Hewitt, It is ordered that Theodore S. Turner, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that G. Wayne Gray, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Cornelius Anderson suing on behalf of himself and all other Seamen etc., Petitioner,
306 vs.
Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. T. Eldridge for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner.

Leslie A. Gilmore, Plaintiff in error,
130 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther et al., Appellants,
372 vs.
William Duby, H. B. Van Duzer, and W. H. Malone etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. M. Devers for the appellees. The Court declined to hear further argument.

R. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther, H. M. Hewitt and Lew Nuremaker etc., et al., Appellants,
372 vs.
William Duby, H. B. Van Duzer

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby vacated without costs to either party, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint on the ground that this cause has become moot through the rescission of the assailed order of the Oregon State Highway Commission, subject however, to leave to the appellants to move for the vacation of this decree within thirty days herefrom if they question the rescission of such order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
284 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States of America, continued by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Appellant,
281 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and The Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad Company.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
282 vs.
The Virginian Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James W. Carmalt for the Virginian Railway Company, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ORDER.

In pursuance of the order of this Court entered October 5, 1921, directing, among other things, the deposit, by the Clerk, in a special fund, of interest on bank deposits accruing from moneys paid to the Clerk by

litigants; and the order entered October 10, 1921, providing that the fees paid to the Clerk by attorneys for admission to the bar, over and above $3000.00 in any one year, shall be kept in a special fund to be expended for specified purposes, including fees in litigated cases in which the parties, or either of them, are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis.

It is now here ordered that, pursuant to the direction of the Court, the Clerk shall be and he is hereby, authorized to transfer and pay from this special fund such sums as may be necessary to pay costs in proceedings in forma pauperis in cases which may be docketed upon the filing by petitioner of a proper affidavit in accordance with law.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton, It is ordered that James H. Littlehales, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin Clyde Baggarly, It is ordered that Harry B. Parris, Esquire, of Eufaula, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Shelby M. Jett, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Henry George Gross, Esquire, of Somerset, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence S. Ferris, It is ordered that Charles P. O'Neil, Esquire, Clarence E. Page, Esquire, and John R. Watkins, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, and Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., Esquire, and Albert J. Danaher, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Frank M. Parrish, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Hultman, It is ordered that Alexis J. Rogoski, Esquire, of Muskegon, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. McCoy, It is ordered that Harry L. Jacobs, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant I. Rosenzweig, It is ordered that Julius C. Shapiro, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte Appel, It is ordered that Henry C. Hunter, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Will Moore, Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,

Appellant,

185 vs.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company, and National Surety Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and on rule to show cause why the appeal in this cause should not be dismissed, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Doras Hebert, Alcee Benoit, John Miller, and Clobule Arabie,

Plaintiffs in error,

24 vs.

State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William M. Webb,

Petitioner,

703 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered by this Court that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. Webb,

Petitioner,

703 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Uihlein, August E. Uihlein, George Uihlein, et al., Plaintiffs in error,

175 vs.

The State of Wisconsin, Neele E. Neelen, Public Administrator of Milwaukee County et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; ~~and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Steel Products Company, claimant and owner of S. S. "Steel Trader", et al., Petitioners,
568 vs.
Donald J. Adams.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioners,
577 vs.
E. B. Spiller et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. L. Eveland, Hugh Smith and B. W. Baer, Constituting The Tax Commission of the State of South Dakota, Petitioners,
592 vs.
Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Insurance Company, Agricultural Insurance Company, Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia et al.,
Petitioners,
601 vs.
Ben C. Hyde, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of Missouri.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lee Popham,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
The United States of America, Owner of Steam Tug Barrenfork.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. J. Riggs,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Siegel Workman, United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. J. (Bear Cat) Riggs,

Petitioner,

560 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,

562 vs.

The United States of America and Flannery, Guinan and Moran, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
The United States of America and Flannery, Guinan and Moran, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Samuel and Sons, Inc., Petitioner,
565 vs.
The Second National Bank of Toledo.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New State Land Company, H. F. Wilcox, Oil and Gas Company, Albert Melly et al., Petitioners,
566 vs.
Robert Kelley and Sukey Kelley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Rauch,
Petitioner,
569 vs.
A. F. Duff.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
571 vs.
J. J. Cammack.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Calcasieu National Bank of Southwest Louisiana, Petitioner,
572 vs.
Alfred Campbell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William G. Benham and Dwight Harrison, Petitioners,
573 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William F. Williams and Frank E. Lyman, Commissioners of Public Works, etc., Petitioners,
576 vs.
General Outdoor Advertising Company, Inc., O. J. Gude Company, Thomas Cusack Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henderson County, Tennessee, Petitioner,
578 vs.
Sovereign Camp, Woodmen of the World.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Langstaff,

Petitioner,

584 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States, Kentucky District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. I. Winsett, Nathan Kendall, Charles E. Walker et al.,

Petitioners,

585 vs.

H. J. Spurway, Receiver of The Tucson National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Wehby, John Joseph, Raf R. Flores et al., Petitioners,

586 vs.

H. J. Spurway, Receiver of The Tucson National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Montana,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
Sunburst Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
Mrs. Jennie M. Rascoe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gordon Campbell,
Petitioner,
590 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ford Hydro-Electric Company,
Petitioner,
593 vs.
Janet Meeley et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George S. Kunihiro,
Petitioner,
594 vs.
M. O. Coggins Company, Clifford A. Coggins, C. Swift Bollens et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George S. Kunihiro,
Petitioner,
595 vs.
The Lyon Brothers Company, Arthur Miller, M. O. Coggins Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sioux City Bridge Company,

Petitioner,

597 vs.

Walter E. Miller, as County Treasurer of Dakota County, Nebraska et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Celluloid Company,

Petitioner,

598 vs.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aaron T. Bliss, Clerk of Midland County and Henry W. Harrison, Treasurer of Midland County,

Petitioners,

599 vs.

James C. Graves and Clifford G. Olmstead.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central National Bank of Marietta, Ohio, as Administrator de bonis non of the Estate of Harry B. Hulings, deceased, Petitioner,
600 vs.
Commodore D. Dodson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren O. Watson, Trustee in Bankruptcy et al., Petitioner,
602 vs.
J. Hall LeBlanc, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Chin Hen Youe, Appellant,
58 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to remand this cause to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with directions to dismiss the petition for a writ of

habeas corpus without prejudice and without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Surety Company of Des Moines, Iowa, Plaintiff in error,
146 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to transfer this case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
507 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

C. Dewey Brian et al., Plaintiffs in error,
553 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
6 Orig. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant,
The United States of America, Intervener.

The form of decree proposed by Texas and the United States was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Ward for the State of Texas and leave was granted to counsel to submit suggestion as to Commissioners to be appointed herein.

Canal-Commercial Trust and Savings Bank et al., Plaintiffs in error,
524 vs.
Karl Brewer.

The motion to amend the judgment in this cause by taxing penalty and costs was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Warfield Ross in behalf of Mr. John W. Cutrer for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Garner W. Green, and Mr. Chalmers Potter for the plaintiffs in error

R. C. Breen, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
334 vs.
Morton Denison Hull et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stiles W. Burr in behalf of Mr. Frank D. Adams, Mr. Elmer F. Blu, Mr. George W. Morgan, Mr. Nathan L. Miller, and Mr. Kenneth B. Halstead for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport, Mr. Charles Martindale, and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the petitioners.

H. A. Pharr, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Mobile Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
635 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Henry C. Hunter in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of the Council of American Shipbuilders, Inc., as amicus curiae in this cause.

Frederick L. Miller,
Plaintiff in error,
512 vs.
The State of Oregon.

On motion of Mr. J. C. Trimble for the plaintiff in error, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, January 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
14 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion for an order or direction that the parties may participate in the trial of the related suit of State of Wisconsin v. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, before the Special Master, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. S. Ferris and Mr. Albert Ottinger for the complainant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz, and Mr. Hugh S. Johnson for defendant, The State of Illinois, and by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Hector A. Brouillet, and Mr. Morton S. Cressy for defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago, in opposition thereto.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and
Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion of the State of Arkansas for leave to intervene and become a party defendant and adopt the answer heretofore filed by intervening defendants submitted by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of Mr. William B. Applegate, Mr. Daniel N. Kirby, and Mr. Cornelius Lynde for the State of Arkansas.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and
Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion of the State of Mississippi for leave to intervene and become a party defendant and adopt the answer heretofore filed by intervening defendants was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of Mr. Rush H. Knox, Mr. Daniel N. Kirby, and Mr. Cornelius Lynde for the State of Mississippi.

Ex parte: In the matter of
William G. Benham, Petitioner.
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in behalf of Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. R. H. Kevin for the petitioner.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al.,
Appellants,
184, of October Term, 1925,
vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

The motion to reinstate this cause and for leave to file petition and supplemental petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Jones for the appellants in support of the motion, and leave was granted to Mr. Henry C. Clark to file printed opposition on behalf of the appellee within ten days.

H. C. Breen, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
334 vs.
Morton Denison Hull et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stiles W. Burr in behalf of Mr. Frank D. Adams, Mr. Elmer F. Blu, Mr. George W. Morgan, Mr. Nathan L. Miller, and Mr. Kenneth B. Halstead for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport, Mr. Charles Martindale, and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the petitioners.

H. A. Pharr, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Mobile Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Henry C. Hunter in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of the Council of American Shipbuilders, Inc., as amicus curiae in this cause.

Frederick L. Miller,
Plaintiff in error,
512 vs.
The State of Oregon.

On motion of Mr. J. C. Trimble for the plaintiff in error, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, January 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
14 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion for an order or direction that the parties may participate in the trial of the related suit of State of Wisconsin v. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, before the Special Master, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. S. Ferris and Mr. Albert Ottinger for the complainant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz, and Mr. Hugh S. Johnson for defendant, The State of Illinois, and by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Hector A. Brouillet, and Mr. Morton S. Cressy for defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago, in opposition thereto.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and
Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion of the State of Arkansas for leave to intervene and become a party defendant and adopt the answer heretofore filed by intervening defendants submitted by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of Mr. William B. Applegate, Mr. Daniel H. Kirby, and Mr. Cornelius Lynde for the State of Arkansas.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and
Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion of the State of Mississippi for leave to intervene and become a party defendant and adopt the answer heretofore filed by intervening defendants was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of Mr. Rush H. Knox, Mr. Daniel H. Kirby, and Mr. Cornelius Lynde for the State of Mississippi.

Ex parte: In the matter of
William G. Benham, Petitioner.
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in behalf of Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. R. H. Kevin for the petitioner.

Enrique del Pozo y Marcos et al.,
Appellants,
184, of October Term, 1925,
vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

The motion to reinstate this cause and for leave to file petition and supplemental petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Jones for the appellants in support of the motion, and leave was granted to Mr. Henry C. Clark to file printed opposition on behalf of the appellee within ten days.

The Celluloid Company,
Plaintiff in error,
665 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman in behalf of Mr. Joseph Larocque for the plaintiff in error.

Millsaps College,
Plaintiff in error,
35 vs.
City of Jackson.

On motion of Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of counsel, this cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

William A. Zeidler,
Petitioner,
548 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, Mr. Archibald Cox, and Mr. O. Kilery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Harry E. Knight, and Mr. Manuel Wittemore for the respondent.

William A. Gillespie and Frank X. Kinsly, Petitioners,
660 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Conboy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. J. Kennedy White for the respondent.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. William De Forest Manice for the respondent.

Steam Tug "Esther M. Rendel,"
George T. Rendle,
Petitioners,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Dillaway for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Emlenton Refining Company,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
Walter A. Chambers, Trading as
G. L. P. Chambers and Company etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Mullin and Mr. W. Pitt Gifford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry J. Bigham for the respondent.

Marshall Hodgman et al.,
Petitioners,
681 vs.
The Atlantic Refining Company
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Andrew C. Gray for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Mr. Robert H. Richards, and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondents.

Carnegie Steel Company,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
The Colorado Fuel and Iron
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Anthony Usina, Mr. Henry M. Huxley, and Mr. George W. Morgan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred Farrar for the respondent.

Wesley L. Sischo,
Petitioner,
687 vs.
Finch R. Archer, as Warden of the United States Penitentiary at McNeil Island, Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

James Cusmano,
Petitioner,
670 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 22d next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced:

It becomes the sad duty of the Court to announce that since its last adjournment, Mr. Justice McKenna, recently retired from this Court, has passed away. His death occurred at 1:45 A. M. yesterday. No one who was present will forget the affecting scene and farewell in 1925 when the Justice in this room took his leave of the Court and his colleagues. As a mark of love and a tribute of respect for his twenty-seven years of distinguished and useful service on this Bench, the Court will, after the delivery of opinions this morning adjourn until Tuesday noon, and will attend the funeral to be held this day at his late residence in thiscity at 3 P. M.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
239 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

D. H. Brasfield, Mark Williver, and William Barion, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 243 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

C. A. Hudson and H. H. Brogan, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 307 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce
Commission, Appellants,
284 vs.
The New York Central Railroad
Company.

Appeal from the District Court
of the United States for the
Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Stella Van Oster,
Plaintiff in error,
303 vs.
The State of Kansas.

In error to the Supreme Court
of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Charles H. Graves,
Plaintiff in error,
320 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court
of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
36 vs.
Essex Rubber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

John W. McCardle, Maurice Douglass, Oscar Ratts, Et al., as Members of the Public Service Commission of Indiana et al., Appellants,
37 vs.
Indianapolis Water Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Stone.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians,

Petitioner,

250 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Cornelius Anderson, Suing on behalf of himself and all other Seamen, etc.,

306 vs.

Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, Pacific American Steamship Association, Their Members, etc., et al.

Petitioner,

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The Village of Euclid, Ohio, and Harry W. Stein, Inspector of Buildings for the Village of Euclid, Appellants, vs. Ambler Realty Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Butler.

No. 9, Original.—October Term, 1926.
[No. 19. Original.—October Term, 1925.]

State of Michigan, Complainant,
vs.
State of Wisconsin.

DECREE.

[November 22, 1926.]

Announced by Mr. Justice Sutherland.

This cause having been heard and submitted upon certain questions, and the Court having considered the same and announced its conclusions in an opinion delivered March 1, 1926 (270 U. S. 295),

Now for the purpose of carrying the said opinion into effect, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed:

1. That the boundary between the States of Michigan and Wisconsin along the following course be and it is hereby fixed and finally established as follows:

From Lake Superior through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River, to the headwaters thereof, as established in the survey of Captain Cram at the junction of the Pine River and Balsam Creek (also known as Lehman's Creek), thence along the line of the survey of William A. Burt of 1847, to the center of the channel between Middle and South Islands in the Lake of the Desert, thence continuing along the line of said survey to the shore of Lake Brulé, thence along the southerly shore of Lake Brulé to the center of the main channel of the River Brulé, thence down the center of the main channel of the rivers Brulé and Menominee, to the center of the harbor entrance of said Menominee River, thence in a direct line to the most usual ship channel of Green Bay, passing to the north of Green Island and westerly of Chambers Island and

through the Rock Island Passage into Lake Michigan, by courses and distances as follows: From a point midway between the outer ends of the Menominee River piers, thence east by south, seven and one-half miles to the center of the most usual ship channel of the Green Bay, thence along said ship channel north by east one-eighth east, eight and seven-eighths miles, thence continuing along said ship channel north by east seven-eights east, twenty-seven miles, thence continuing along said ship channel, east one-fourth north, ten and one-fourth miles, thence east three-fourths north to the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the middle of Lake Michigan. Provided, that the section of the boundary in the Brulé and Menominee rivers shall follow the main channel thereof, except that where islands occur in the Brulé River or in the Menominee River, down to and inclusive of the Quinnesec Falls, extending to the line between sections 5 and 6, Township 38 north, of Range 20 east, of the Wisconsin Public Survey, extended across said river, the line shall pass through the channel nearest the Wisconsin bank, so as to throw all such islands into Michigan; and where islands occur in the Menominee River below the Quinnesec Falls, the line shall pass through the channel nearest the Michigan bank, so as to throw all such islands into Wisconsin. Provided further, that the land known as "Merryman's Island," being surveyed as part of sections 20 and 29, Township 36 north, of Range 28 west, of the Michigan Public Survey, and the land known as "Sugar Island," being a part of lots 1 and 2, Section 11, lot 6 of Section 2, and lot 1 of Section 3, Township 31 north, of Range 27 west, of the Michigan Public Survey, is determined to be part of the mainland of Michigan.

The costs of this proceeding in this Court shall be divided equally between the parties.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

115 vs.

One Ford Coupe Automobile, No. 4776501, Alabama License No. 10978, Garth Motor Company, Claimant.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, It is ordered that Frank H. Myers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that Harry M. Carroll, Esquire, of Donna, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Charles H. Garnett, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, Isadore Bockstein, Esquire, and Joseph Greenberg, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that William A. Cuff, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth, It is ordered that Frank J. Hennessy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Fairbanks, It is ordered that Edward S. Bentley, Esquire, of Lawrence, Long Island, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton, It is ordered that Anthony Honnebaum, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Dominic P. Servald, Esquire, and Albert E. Griffiths, Esquire, of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Pollak, It is ordered that R. W. Henderson, Esquire, of Bakersfield, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. O'Shea, It is ordered that Anna L. Cooke, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Theodore M. Stuart, Esquire, of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Francis D. Butler, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Port Gardner Investment Company,
173 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that question No. 5, construed as statedin the opinion, should be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Butler.
Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
William F. Brims, Stanley Muszalski, B.J. G. Wittman et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
96 vs.
Western Meat Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated by the opinion of this Court, and as so modified is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Thatcher Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part, and affirmed in part, with costs to the petitioner; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Stone.

Swift and Company,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Lucksenbach Steamship Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
32 vs.
The United States.
Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Benjamin I. Salinger, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
238 vs.
The United States of America.
In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, in accordance with the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Die Deutsche Bank Filiale Nurnberg,

Petitioner,

224 vs.

Charles Franklin Humphrey.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Butler.
Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Massachusetts State Grange, The Inhabitants of the Town of Hadley, Massachusetts; The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al.,

Appellants,

296 vs.

Jay R. Benton, as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Frederick W. Cook, as Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Payson Smith, as Commissioner of Education etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Separate opinion delivered by:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William Earl Dodge and Joshua T. Dodge, Petitioners,
341 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hughes Bros. Timber Company, Petitioner,
170 vs.
State of Minnesota.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
113 vs.
General Electric Company, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, and Westinghouse Lamp Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
7 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
The State of New York, Complainant,
14 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

ORDER.

Upon motion of the State of New York, it is ordered that the parties to the suit of the State of New York v. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago be permitted to participate in the taking of evidence in the hearing before the special master heretofore appointed in the case of the State of Wisconsin v. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of

Chicago, in like manner as if those suits had been consolidated; and the Court reserves to itself authority to order such a consolidation if it becomes proper to do so. But this order is made without prejudice to the authority of the Court hereafter to make any order which it may deem proper respecting the matters set forth in the third paragraph of the bill of complaint in the case of The State of New York v. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, and respecting the issues that may arise from the presence of that paragraph in that bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Surety Company of Des Moines, Iowa, Plaintiff in error,
146 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, and on motion to transfer, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. Dewey Brian, Gaither Moore, Joseph E. Brian, and Neal Moore, Plaintiffs in error,
553 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Canal-Commercial Trust and Savings Bank and Union Indemnity Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
524 vs.
Karl Brewer.

On consideration of the motion to amend the judgment of this Court in this cause by assessing damages as penalty for delay,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Orig. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motions of the States of Arkansas and Mississippi for leave to intervene and become parties defendants and adopt the answer heretofore filed by intervening defendants in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the matter of
William G. Benham, Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Enrique Del Pozo y Marcos et al.,
Appellants,
184 of October Term, 1925,
vs.
Wilson Cypress Company.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause and for leave to file petition and supplemental petition for rehearing herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Celluloid Company,
Plaintiff in error,
565 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of the parts of the record to be printed in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 17th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 17th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. C. Breen et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
334 vs.
Morton Denison Hull et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the matter of Vincent I. Whitman, et al.,
Petitioners,
-- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application for the writ to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, as the applicants may be advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
570 vs.
United Cigar Stores Company of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
604 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

N. and G. Taylor Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
John A. Anderson and C. A. Gustafson, doing business under the name of Anderson and Gustafson, copartners.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
607 vs.
Loi Hoa.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Lem Young, for and on behalf of Phuong Con.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel V. Harkin, and Union Bank of Chicago, Receiver, etc., Petitioners,
609 vs.
Edward J. Brundage, Receiver etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, As United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner, vs. Walter E. Frew, Warren B. Nash and The Corn Exchange Bank, as Executors etc.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
615	Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Rosenberg Brothers and Company.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
617	Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. California Wine Association.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
618	Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. S. L. Jones and Company.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted.
619	

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
David R. J. Arnold, as Administrator with the Will Annexed of Mary E. Jordan, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
627 vs.
George P. Miller, Nelson S. Hopkins, Clarence L. Dillon, as Trustees, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
642 vs.
Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against The American Loan and Trust Company, Administrator of the Estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Maul,
Petitioner,
655 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod and Kuhne,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President under Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,
662 vs.
Edward Goodyear, as Administrator of the Estate of Lewis Goodyear, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
669 vs.
Leib Hitterman.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
ex rel. Julio E. Roman Checa,
Petitioner,
391 vs.
George E. Williams, Criminal Sheriff, Parish of Orleans, Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Zeidler,
Petitioner,
548 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad
Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
589 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sinclair Refining Company and
United Dredging Company,
Petitioners,
603 vs.
Alonzo Smith and N. W. Washburn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Dry Dock and Construction Company, Petitioner,
610 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John E. Wagner,

Petitioner,

611 vs.

Netherlands American Steam Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. Petitioner,

612 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luther Walker,

Petitioner,

613 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Piedmont Coal Company, Ayrshire Corporation, Ohio County Fuel Company et al., Petitioners,
614 vs.
James Edgar Hustead, Albert Miller Hustead, and Walter Bugh Hustead.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Ohio County, of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Ohio County of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President operating the Lehigh Valley Railroad, Petitioner,
621 vs.
New York and New Jersey Transportation Company and John Mosk.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Graves,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
Frank W. Brunskill, Chief of Police of the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota, and S. O. Lockwood, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas Flour Mills Company,
Petitioner,
624 vs.
The Farmers National Bank of Burlington Kansas, and H. M. Dudley, as Receiver of the Farmers National Bank of Burlington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Larabee Flour Mills Corporation, Petitioner,
625 vs.
The First National Bank of Henryetta, Oklahoma, and Jonas J. Hulse, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Henryetta, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Colonial Transportation Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
628 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Moore, Administrator of the Estate of Earl H. Moore, deceased, Petitioner,
629 vs.
The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Saturnino Lopez, Petitioner,
631 vs.
Manuel Ernesto Gonzalez.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul M. Ashbaugh,

Petitioner,

632 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paradon Engineering Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

656 vs.

Electro Bleaching Gas Company and Wallace and Tiernan Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Addison Miller, Security Storage Company, Ryan Hotel Company et al., Petitioners,

640 vs.

City of St. Paul.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Jennings and Creekmore Wallace, Petitioners,
641 vs.
Lonzetta Canady and Mountain State Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
645 vs.
Gertrude Mappin, Administratrix of the Estate of Walter W. Mappin, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Caron Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
Henri Muracur et. Cie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Knickerbocker Merchandising Company, Inc., Maurice Innerfield and Emanuel Seaman, Petitioners,
650 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. E. McLendon, Petitioner,
651 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
653 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr, A. B. Wells, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration or the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Florida, ex rel. R. Hudson Burr, A. S. Wells, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

654

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The National Bank of Commerce in St. Louis, Petitioner, vs. Henry Clay Pierce. — Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

659

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Gillespie and Frank X. Kinzly, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

660

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steam Tug "Esther M. Rendle", George T. Rendle, Petitioners,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emlenton Refining Company,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
Walter A. Chambers, Trading as C. L. P. Chambers and Company, to the use of James A. Adams, Trading as Adams and Thompson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marshall Hodgman, George L. Seidman, Percy Heineman et al.,
Petitioners,
681 vs.
The Atlantic Refining Company and Superior Oil Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carnegie Steel Company,

Petitioner,

683 vs.

The Colorado Fuel and Iron Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wesley L. Sischo,

Petitioner,

687 vs.

Finch R. Archer, as Warden of the United States Penitentiary at McNeil Island, State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

67 vs.

George C. Taylor, as President of the American Express Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer C. Potter, Federal Prohibition Director for the District of Massachusetts, Appellant,
145 vs.
James Geraghty.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and on motion to remand submitted by counsel, pursuant to stipulation.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted;

And it is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to that Court to vacate its judgment and to enter an order providing for the destruction of the liquors forthwith.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf the mandate in this cause was granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wong Hay Pow et al.,
Appellants,
556 vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee in support of the motion.

E. A. Edenfield,
Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to restore this case to the call and set the date for the argument thereof was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Mammoth Oil Company et al.,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for additional time within which to file brief for the respondent in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. John W. Lacey and Mr. George P. Hoover in opposition thereto.

George R. Dale,
Plaintiff in error,
656 vs.
The State of Indiana.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward M. White and Mr. Arthur L. Gilliom for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Velpeau Rooker for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge et al.

On motion of counsel in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of Arthur D. Hill and Richard H. Wiswall as amici curiae in this cause.

Olaf Qualsett,
Plaintiff in error,
309 vs.
Reinold Kattenburg et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. D. Williams for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Willis E. Reed for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United Fuel Gas Company et al., Appellants,
184 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Kentucky et al., etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Harold A. Ritz in that behalf this case was passed until case No. 439 is reached, per stipulation of counsel.

H. A. Pharr, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Mobile Shipbuilding Company, Petitioner,
635 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Samuel T. Ansell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief for the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., as amicus curiae in this cause.

Henry W. McMaster et al., as Receivers of the Wabash, Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company,

Petitioners,

482 vs.

George J. Gould et al., as Executors etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fulton R. Brylawski in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. James Marshall for the petitioners.

Alabama and Vicksburg Railway Company et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

244 of October Term, 1925.

vs.

Jackson and Eastern Railway Company.

The motion to retax costs in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Miller in behalf of Mr. George B. Neville and Mr. H. R. Stone for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

Oklahoma Coal Company,

Plaintiff in error,

737 vs.

R. Atkinson, G. Blevin, E. A. Barbee et al.

Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, of counsel for the defendants in error having filed in open Court the following certificiate, To-wit:

"IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

Oklahoma Coal Company, Plaintiff in error,

vs.

R. Atkinson, G. Blevin, E. A. Barbee, J. W. Blevin, C. O. Bailey, P. Brooks, Joe Berkey, P. R. Coffee, C. Cogburn, W. Doyle, C. Dawson, J. C. Fewell, R. Condermann, Jno. Ganta, R. Garrett, B. Golightly, I. Garrett, E. C. Goodin, L. V. Gooden, W. Cale, E. Grimes, P. Harris, J. M. Holmes, J. Hollins, B. I. Holmes, D. Hamilton, Riley Harris, B. Hamilton, Sam Kelch, R. L. Lewis, R. Lipps, G. W. Lewellen, G. C. Martin, G. V. Martin, John Miller, J. Madden, R. Myers, N. Myers, W. Miller, M. Manes, H. Martin, J. McCarthy, B. McBee, C. McCurry, G. R. Morton,

No. 16,387.

Wm. Nelson, John Phipps, M. S. Pool, T. Ponchart, H. Pool, Joe Riley, A. J. Rauquet, J. C. Rogers, A. Shawn, J. Smothers, L. Shawn M. Smith, J. Teague, Sol Teague, F. Verne, P. Wantiez, L. Washam, O. Ward, H. Wakefield, Roy Williams, F. Williams, L. Zeahlka, A. Hendricks, A. Galiardo, Jack Dillard, and Bill Collins,

Defendants in error.

I, WILLIAM M. FRANKLIN, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that in the above entitled and numbered cause pending in the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, wherein the said Oklahoma Coal Company was plaintiff in error and the said R. Atkinson, G. Blevin, E. A. Barbee, J. W. Blevin, C. O. Bailey, P. Brooks, Joe Berkey, P. R. Coffee, C. Cogburn, W. Doyle, C. Dawson, J. C. Powell, R. Conderman, Jno. Ganta, R. Garrett, B. Golightly, I. Garrett, E. C. Goodin, L. V. Gooden, W. Gale, E. Grimes, P. Harrish, J. M. Holmes, J. Hollins, B. I. Holmes, D. Hamilton, Riley Harris, B. Hamilton, Sam Keloh, R. L. Lewis, R. Lipps, G. W. Lewellen, C. C. Martin, C. V. Martin, John Miller, J.Madden, H. Myers, R. Myers, W. Miller, M. Manez, H. Martin, J. McCarthy, B. McBee, C. McCurry, G. R. Norton, Wm. Nelson, John Phipps, M. S. Pool, T. Ponchart, H. Pool, Joe Riley, A. J. Rauquet, J. C. Rogers, A. Shawn, J. Smothers, L. Shawn, M. Smith, J. Teague, Sol Teague, F. Verne, P. Wantiez, L. Washam, O. Ward, H. Wakefield, Roy Williams, F. Williams, L. Zeahlka, A. Hendricks, A. Galiardo, Jack Dillard, and Bill Collins, were defendants in error, an opinion was handed down by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma affirming the judgment of the District Court of Okmulgee County, Oklahoma, from which said Court an appeal had been prosecuted, said opinion being rendered on the 16th day of February, 1926; that thereupon a petition for writ of error was filed by the Oklahoma Coal Company, the plaintiff in error and on the 26th day of July, 1926, the writ of error was presented to the Honorable George M. Nicholson, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, and the writ of error was approved and allowed by him on the said 26th day of July, 1926; that on the same date a citation was issued and signed by the said Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, which citation was returnable thirty (30) days from the date thereof; that on the 29th day of July, 1926, a bond was filed by the Oklahoma Coal Company, plaintiff in error, conditioned according to law in the sum of $15,000.00 and same has since

that time operated as a supersedeas bond; that on the 19th day of August, 1926, an order was entered by the Honorable George M. Nicholson, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, granting to the Oklahoma Coal Company, plaintiff in error, sixty (60) days within which to file the record in said cause in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma this 12th day of November, A. D. 1926.

(SEAL) (Signed) WM. M. FRANKLIN,
Clerk, Supreme Court,
Oklahoma City, Okla."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

AND IT APPEARING TO THE COURT that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in accordingly to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re Disbarment of Sidney A. Schwartz.

The petition of the Grievance Committee of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland for the Committee.

R. Burney Long,
Plaintiff in error,
472 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

On motion of Mr. Bernard F. Garvey in behalf of Mr. R. Burney Long, the plaintiff in error in this cause, this case was passed and reassigned for argument on Monday, January 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Wallace R. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii et al., Petitioners, vs. Tokushige et al.

465

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. William B. Lymer for the petitioners.

Henry F. Mueller, Josephine Waldeck, Leona Mueller, by Josephine Waldeck, Curatrix et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel W. Adler, St. Louis Transit Company, and United Railways Company of St. Louis.

4

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Hartley Dodge, Petitioner, vs. Minnie E. Allison and Audrey E. Allison, Executors of J. Wesley Allison, deceased.

639

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr, Mr. Peter M. Speer, and Mr. Russell H. Robbins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Charles M. Cotterman,
Petitioner,
633 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Norman, Mr. Daniel R. Williams, Mr. Walter H. Barton, and Mr. J. J. Lynch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

H. A. Pharr, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Mobile Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
635 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Monte Appel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Arthur Cobb for the respondent.

James A. Baker, Receiver of the International and Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
663 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Carter Pope for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

W. J. Tubbs,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
The State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred B. Morrill and Mr. F. H. McDermont for the petitioner.

Ed. W. Hopkins, Assessor of the County of Los Angeles, State of California et al.,
Petitioners,
673 vs.
Southern California Telephone Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett W. Mattoon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Oscar Lawler, Mr. F. D. Madison, and Mr. Alfred Sutro for the respondents.

Rodolfo A. Fajardo,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gabriel La O for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Rigby for the respondent.

Guy H. Shown, Trustee in Bankruptcy in the matter of R. R. Baker, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
680 vs.
Robert R. Baker, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Burrow for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Shelton for the respondent.

George A. Moore and Company,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
Edgar Mathieu.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Knight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles D. Hamel for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Belridge Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Nat M. Lacy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar Lawler for the respondent.

Joe Miller et al., Individually and as Executors of the Estate of L. Miller, deceased,
Petitioners,
688 vs.
George W. Brown and J. O. Sims, Receivers of Miller-Link Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Kaiser for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. M. Garwood for the respondents.

Ranghild Johnson,
Petitioner,
689 vs.
The Whitney Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the petitioner.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
690 vs.
Howe-McCurtain Coal and Coke Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. James H. Gordon for the respondent.

United Verde Copper Company, Petitioner,
692 vs.
W. A. Jordan, W. E. Jordan, C. A. Jordan et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Rice and Mr. Clifton Mathews for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Harr for the respondents.

United Verde Extension Mining Company, Petitioner,
693 vs.
W. A. Jordan, W. E. Jordan, C. A. Jordan, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. Ellinwood, Mr. Howard Cormick, and Mr. John Mason Ross for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Harr for the respondents.

Edwin H. Armstrong et al., Petitioners,
694 vs.
Lee De Forest et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Kerr and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioners.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
696 vs.
Arkell and Douglas, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Horace M. Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
Moritz Neuberger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Thomas B. Shoemaker, and Mr. Henry B. Hazard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the respondent.

Albert Ross,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl J. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Peter C. Jarzewski,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Payne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Max Wosinski,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Payne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Sam Laskolin,
Petitioner,
706 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira J. Pettiford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Heber Nations.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles G. Revelle and Mr. Patrick H. Cullen for the respondent.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, on relation of Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Petitioner,
702 vs.
Waldemar Conrad Von Zedtwitz, United States Trust Company of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin D. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander P. Humphrey, Mr. Edward P. Humphrey, Mr. Charles W. Milner, Mr. William A. W. Stewart, and Mr. George L. Shearer for the respondents.

Arthur H. Lamborn et al., surviving partners doing business under the firm name and style of Lamborn and Company,
Petitioners,
704 vs.
The Steamship "Texas Maru", Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren for the petitioners, and by Mr. George C. Sprague for the respondent.

Robert David Kercheval, otherwise called "Bob" Kercheval, otherwise called "Dave" Kercheval,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy and Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Dorothy Lee,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hennessy and Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John Carlton Dysart,
Petitioner,
102 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted by Mr. J. W. Marrow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mrs. Bill Breaux,
Plaintiff in error,
561 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was submitted by Mr. A. R. Mitchell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Percy Saint and Mr. E. R. Schowalter for the defendant in error.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Orig. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Edward A. Harriman in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Mr. Edward A. Harriman as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Orig. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Thomas B. Adams in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Mr. Thomas B. Adams as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of Florida,
Complainant,
-- Orig. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States et al.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause in this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendants, continued by Mr. John B. Johnson for the complainant, and concluded by Mr. Peter O. Knight for the complainant.

Henry Albrecht, Sr., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
9 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth, It is ordered that Ira L. Ewers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Carmen Adams Newcomb, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Alfred M. Saperston, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that William Ritchie, Jr., Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Miller, It is ordered that John E. McClure, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Trammell, It is ordered that Clyde G. Trammell, Esquire, of Melbourne, State of Florida, and Ezekiel R. Stegall, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Thomas Murphy and Vincent Murphy,
443 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States and submitted by Mr. Thomas Murphy and Mr. Vincent Murphy pro se.

Wong Tai, alias Wong Sue Jun, alias Wong Wai, Plaintiff in error,
79 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error.

Enrique Collado,
Appellant,
81 vs.
Manuel Mater Girona, Marshal, District Court of San Juan, P. R., 1st District.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Rigby for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. James A. O'Shea for the appellant.

John E. McGuire
85 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States, and submitted by Mr. Hanson H. Gillett for McGuire.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
95 vs.
George A. Storrs, Joseph S. Welch et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Dan B. Shields and Mr. Albert R. Barnes for the defendants in error.

William Burns,
Plaintiff in error,
135 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. W. Henderson for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. R. W. Henderson for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America ex rel. Emanuel Vajtauer,
Appellant,
111 vs.
The Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that James A. O'Callaghan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that T. R. Boone, Esquire, and John B. King, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Hill, It is ordered that J. Fred Katzmaier, Esquire, of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that John F. Richter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Charles N. Kirkbride, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., It is ordered that Edward Joseph Grove, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Ofell Haller Johnson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Armond W. Scott, It is ordered that Ramon A. Martinez, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August C. Guthiem, It is ordered that William H. Speer, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that John E. Erwin, Esquire, of Dixon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements, It is ordered that Louis T. Hengstler, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Cologero Fasulo,

Petitioner,

251 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Charles V. Duffy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

108 vs.

The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New Jersey; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Samuel W. Lambert,

Appellant,

47 vs.

Edward C. Yellowley, as Acting Federal Prohibition Director; David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and William Hayward, as United States Attorney.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Butler.
Mr. Justice Stone.

George M. Napier, Attorney General of the State of Georgia,

Appellant,

87 vs.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin. 310 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin. 311 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Wachovia Bank and Trust Company, Administrator C. T. A. D. B. N. of the Estate of Theodosia Haynes Taylor et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. R. A. Doughton, Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina. 49 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
357 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring inthe result;
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
358 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring in the result:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellant,
365 vs.
Kings County Lighting Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring in the result:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

E. A. Edenfield, Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to restore this case to the call, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, January 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
482 vs.
George J. Gould et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace R. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii et al., Petitioners,
485 vs.
T. Tokushige et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mammoth Oil Company et al., Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of the respondent inthis cause to extend the time for filing brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the time for filing brief is extended until December 9th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alabama and Vicksburg Railway Company, Plaintiffs in error,
244 of October Term, 1925. vs.
Jackson and Eastern Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to retax the costs in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In the matter of Disbarment of Sidney A. Schwartz.
-- Original.

On consideration of the petition of the Grievance Committee of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Sidney A. Schwartz show cause before this Court on or before Monday, January 3rd, 1927, why the prayer of the petition should not be granted,

And it is further ordered by this Court that the said Sidney A. Schwartz be, and he is hereby, suspended from practice as a member of the Bar of this Court pending the further order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Enrique Collado,

Appellant,

81 vs.

Manuel Nater Girona, Marshal, District Court of San Juan, P. R., First District.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Olaf Qualsett,

Plaintiff in error,

309 vs.

Reinold Klattenburg and Augusta Anderson.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wong Hay Poy, Wong Tung Hung, and Wong Bing Yuen,

Appellants,

556 vs.

John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Bill Breaux,

Plaintiff in error,

561 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ed. W. Hopkins, Assessor of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, E. M. Ross, Deputy Assessor etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

673 vs.

Southern California Telephone Company and The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
Moritz Neuberger.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert David Kercheval, otherwise called "Bob" Kercheval, otherwise called "Dave" Kercheval,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Cotterman,
Petitioner,
633 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. A. Pharr, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Mobile Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
635 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Baker, Receiver of the International and Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
663 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. J. Tubbs,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rodolfo A. Fajardo,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guy H. Shown, Trustee in Bankruptcy in the matter of R. R. Baker, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
680 vs.
Robert R. Baker, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. A. Moore and Company,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
Edgar Mathieu.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Belridge Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Miller, et al., Individually and as Executors of the Estate of L. Miller, deceased,
Petitioners,
688 vs.
George W. Brown and J. O. Sims, Receivers of Miller-Link Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ranghild Johnson,
Petitioner,
689 vs.
The Whitney Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Howe-McCurtain Coal and Coke Company. 690

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Verde Copper Company, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Jordan, W. E. Jordan, C. A. Jordan et al., etc. 692

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Verde Extension Mining Company, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Jordan, W. E. Jordan, C. A. Jordan et al., etc. 693

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin H. Armstrong and Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company,
Petitioners,
694 vs.
Lee De Forest, De Forest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company, American Telephone and Telegraph Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
696 vs.
Arkell and Douglas, Inc., et al., and Thomas G. Plant Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Ross,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter C. Jezewski,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Wosinski,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Laskolin,
Petitioner,
706 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Heber Nations.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, on relation of Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Waldemar Conrad Von Zedwitz, United States Trust Company of New York and Henry Cochard, Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur H. Lamborn et al., surviving partners doing business under the firm name and style of Lamborn and Company, Petitioners,
704 vs.
The Steamship "Texas Maru", Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Dorothy Lee,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
606 vs.
Akron, Canton and Youngstown
Railway Company et al.
The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
709 vs.
The Berwind-White Coal Mining
Company et al.
The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
710 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company et al.
The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
711 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.
The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
712 vs.
Public Service Gas and Electric Company.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants,

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Executors of the Will of Julia Coolidge.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Leonard B. Smith for the Irving Bank and Trust Company, as Trustee etc., as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
2 Original vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file motion to postpone the hearing of this case heretofore fixed for Monday, January 3rd next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Carroll Todd for the defendant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., in behalf of Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Humboldt Land and Cattle Company, Appellant,
671 vs.
Robert A. Allen, as State Engineer of the State of Nevada etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins for the appellant.

International Stevedoring Company, Petitioner,
236 vs.
R. Haverty.

The motion for leave to file brief on behalf of seven members of the bar of the city of Seattle, Washington, as amici curiae was submitted by Mr. Ira L. Ewers in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

Max Seif, on behalf of Nathan Seif, his brother, Petitioner,
707 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. A. McGee for the petitioner, and by

Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Jesus M. Rossy,
Petitioner,
717 vs.
Rafael Del Valle Zeno.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cornelius C. Webster for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carroll G. Walter and Mr. William Greenough for the respondent.

Mammoth Oil Company et al.,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Hoover, Mr. John W. Lacey, Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. Paul D. Cravath, Mr. J. W. Zevely, and Mr. Edward H. Chandler for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto, on or before December 9th next.

L. Bilodeau et al.,
Petitioners,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. McMillan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

South Bend Bait Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
James Heddon's Sons, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel W. Banning for the respondent.

Harry F. Sinclair and Albert B. Fall, Petitioners,
724 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Hoover, Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. J. W. Zevely, Mr. Henry A. Wise, and Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioners, and by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, Mr. Owen J. Roberts, and Mr. Peyton Gordon for the respondent.

John L. Hicks,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Hicks pro se.

Postum Cereal Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
22 vs.
California Fig Nut Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. Frank F. Reed, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the appellant, no brief filed for the appellee.

James-Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
40 vs.
Carrie M. Harry.

This cause was submitted by Mr. George F. Rearick for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. William M. Acton for the defendant in error.

The United States of America ex rel. Emanuel Vajtauer,
Appellant,
111 vs.
Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the the appellee.

A. J. Byars,
Petitioner,
72 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent, and case submitted by Mr. Claude R. Porter for the petitioner.

Ed Tumey,
Plaintiff in error,
527 vs.
The State of Ohio.

On motion of Mr. Edward P. Moulinier in that behalf, Mr. James L. Magrish allowed to present oral argument for the plaintiff in error, pro hac vice.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward P. Moulinier for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1926

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Arthur L. Veazie, and Henry S. Gray, Esquires, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that Sid White, Esquire, of Okemah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that S. G. McMullin, Esquire, of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander M. Bull, It is ordered that James E. Lyons, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that George Thompson, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Baldwin, It is ordered that George R. Wilbur, Esquire, of Hood River, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick L. Fishback, It is ordered that Carroll Single, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wong Tai, alias Wong Sue Jun, alias Wong Wai,

Plaintiffs in error,

79 vs.

The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Ira L. Myers in behalf of Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth, leave was granted to plaintiff in error to file a reply brief within twenty days.

Ed Tumey,

Plaintiff in error,

527 vs.

The State of Ohio.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward B. Dunford for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. James L. Magrish pro hac vice for the plaintiff in error, with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file additional brief within two weeks and to counsel for the defendant in error to file additional brief within two weeks thereafter.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

537 vs.

Samuel Gettinger, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Isadore Bookstein and Mr. George A. King for the defendant in error.

Paul Schmolke, Plaintiff in error, 647 vs. Daniel J. O'Brien, as Chief of Police, etc.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Theodore M. Stuart for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
John B. Machen and Mary Lois Machen, Plaintiffs in error, 8 vs. City of Waterbury.	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles O'Connor for the defendant in error, and cause submitted by Mr. Lawrence L. Lewis for the plaintiffs in error.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 87 vs. The Trenton Potteries Company et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, It is ordered that George B. Berger, and Walter W. McVay, Esquires, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, It is ordered that Mor Oppman, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Lank, It is ordered that Jay Leo Rothschild, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
27 vs.
The Trenton Potteries Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondents.

Maguire and Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
39 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Edith Stege et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
41 vs.
City of Richmond et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles N. Kirkbride for the defendants in error and cause submitted by Mr. Leonard J. Mather in behalf of Mr. R. M. F. Soto for the plaintiffs in error, with leave to file the brief of plaintiffs in error when received.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, deceased,
Appellants,
42 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Peyton for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

Sophia C. Pitchlynn and others, etc.,
Appellants,
43 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr Harry Peyton for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner, It is ordered that Myrtle B. Wood, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Swagar Shirley, It is ordered that Maclay Hoyne, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Great Northern Railway Company and Central Union Trust Company of New York,

Appellants,

53 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

On motion of Mr. Harold W. Bissell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the Deutsche Bank as amicus curiae in this cause.

Sophia C. Pitchlynn and others, etc.,

Appellants,

43

The Choctaw Nation.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. T. P. Gore for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway

Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company of Hartford,
Petitioner,
45 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Neethe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

Marblehead Land Company,
Plaintiff in error,
50 vs.
County of Los Angeles, Prescott F. Cogswell, J. H. Bean, et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. F. Mitchell for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Marblehead Land Company,
Plaintiff in error,
50 vs.
County of Los Angeles, Prescott F. Cogswell, J. H. Bean, et al., etc.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sacramento Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Milton H. Salz, doing business, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. L. T. Hengstler for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Greene, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion C. Early, It is ordered that James P. Painter, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sacramento Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Milton H. Salz, doing business,
etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. L. T. Hengstler for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Carroll Single for the respondent.

W. T. Waggoner Estate and W. T. Waggoner,
Appellants,
52 vs.
Wichita County and B. B. Sartin
et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Thompson for the appellants, and by Mr. T. R. Boone for the appellees.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1926 - CONTINUED.

Great Northern Railway Company
and Central Union Trust Company
of New York,

Appellants,

53 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walker D. Hines for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 6th next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove, It is ordered that John C. Russell, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that John D. Miller, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin E. Bump, It is ordered that Lloyd D. Mitchell and Edward J. Dempsey, Esquires, of Oshkosh, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that C. E. Spencer, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that J. Harlin O'Connell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue, It is ordered that J. Craig Bradley, Esquire, of Georgetown, State of Kentucky, and James W. Stites, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James D. Carpenter, It is ordered that Jacob R. Mantel, Esquire, of Summit, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Fred L. Sharp, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Benjamin F. Bledsoe, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Adolph Marks, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, It is ordered that James Charles James, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

266 vs.

James W. McElvain and Frank Crozier.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Thomas Murphy and Vincent Murphy,

443 vs.

The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified should be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

No. 606. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 638. Pocahontas Operators' Association, et al., appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 709. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

No. 710. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

No. 711. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

No. 712. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

No. 713. Pocahontas Operators' Association, et al., appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., et al.

No. 714. Pocahontas Operators' Association, et al., appellants, vs. Bethlehem Steel Co., et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants, vs. Rainey-Wood Coke Co., et al. 715

Pocahontas Operators' Association, et al., Appellants, vs. Public Service Electric & Gas Co. 716

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases are assigned for argument as one case on Monday, February 28th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Humboldt Land and Cattle Company, Appellant, vs. Robert A. Allen, as State Engineer of the State of Nevada and Individually, et al. 671

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 2 Original

On Consideration of the motion to postpone the hearing, heretofore set for Monday, January 3rd next, for the purpose of taking additional testimony, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Hicks,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The United States of America

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied. It is further ordered by this Court that the costs already incurred herein be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Hicks,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther, H. M. Hewitt and Lew Nenamaker, Appellants,
372 vs.
William Duby, H. B. Van Duzer, and W. H. Malone, etc.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the decree in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the further consideration of said motion be, and the same is hereby, postponed, and the appellees are directed to file their answer to the motion on or before January 3rd next. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, set for oral hearing on the motion and the appellees reply thereto, as a motion, on January 3rd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul Schmolke,
Plaintiff in error,
647 vs.
Daniel J. O'Brien, as Chief of Police of the City and County of San Francisco.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Supreme Court of the State of California, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John B. Macken and Mary Lois Macken,

Plaintiffs in error,

8 vs.

City of Waterbury.

In error to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Seif, on behalf of Nathan Seif, his brother,

Petitioner,

707 vs.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesus M. Rossy,

Petitioner,

717 vs.

Rafael Del Valle Zeno.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

L. Bilodeau, W. R. Sword, David Everett, and Bernard Frank,
Petitioners,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

South Bend Bait Company,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
James Heddons' Sons, Inc., and Henry S. Dills.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Sinclair and Albert B. Fall,
Petitioners,
724 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Maul,

Petitioner,

665 vs.

The United States.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

669 vs.

Leib Ritterman.

Robert David Kercheval, etc.

Petitioner,

705 vs.

The United States of America.

A. S. Rhodes,

Plaintiff in error,

708 vs.

The State of Georgia.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases upon the docket be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. J. Eiseman and Alexander H. Abrams, Plaintiffs in error,

722 vs.

The People of the State of California.

Holmes Ives and H. J. Whelan,

Plaintiffs in error,

723 vs.

The People of the State of California.

Fairmont Creamery Company,

Plaintiff in error,

725 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr.,

Plaintiff in error,

739 vs.

The State of Florida.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases upon the docket be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Stevedoring Company,

Petitioner,

236 vs.

R. Haverty.

It is ordered that the opinion of this Court in this case announced on October 18th last, be, and it is amended so that the concluding sentence of the opinion shall read as follows:

"In view of the broad field in which Congress has disapproved and changed the rule interduced into the common law within less than a century, we are of opinion that a wider scope should be given to the words of the act, and that in this statute 'seamen' is to be taken to include stevedores employed in maritime work on navigable waters as the plaintiff was, whatever it might mean in laws ofadifferent kind."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 13, 1926, until Monday, January 3, 1927.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chapman S. Clark,

Appellant,

92 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the Court of Claims, in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims, for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James W. Wuchter,

Plaintiff in error,

729 vs.

Michael Pizzutti.

The motion to advance this case for hearing with No. 263 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

Beechnut Packing Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. McClure Johnson for the petitioner.

D. Edmonds et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
500 vs.
The Town of Haskell, Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to dismiss, affirm, or to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. J. Underwood, Mr. Almond D. Cochran and Mr. H. C. Allen for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

H. L. Sveland et al., Constituting the Tax Commission of the State of South Dakota, Petitioners,
592 vs.
Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick and Mr. Byron S. Payne for the petitioners.

James McDonald, Jr., et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
147 vs.
Lawrence Maxwell and Fulton Trust Company, Executors.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John S. Flannery, Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, and Mr. Joseph D. Grayson for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, and Mr. Charles E. Wainwright for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

Harry B. Stils,
Appellant,
38, of October Term, 1925. vs.
The United States.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry B. Stils pro se.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, Mr. Patrick J. Ryan and Mr.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the District of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge, Executors, etc.

On motion of Antoinette Funk in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Antoinette Funk and Arthur F. Mullen as amici curiae.

Ex parte:
In the matter of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
No. -- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic B. Scott for the petitioner.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
726 vs.
Harriet A. Bissett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Isidor Kalisch for the respondent.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
727 vs.
John Hellstab, Judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic B. Scott for the petitioner.

The United States of America ex rel. Vincenzo Cosmano,
Petitioner,
731 vs.
James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor, and W. J. Coyne, Inspector in Charge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Taylor E. Brown for the petitioner.

P. C. Bocrman, doing business under the name and style of the Twentieth Century Company and Lillian Menol,
Petitioners,
733 vs.
Edwards and Deutsch Lithographing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett and Mr. George A. Chritton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wallace H. Lane for the respondent.

Great Northern Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
53 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Walker D. Hines for the appellants, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Walker D. Hines for the appellants.

Pauline Andre De La Mettrie et al.,
Appellants,
54 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt De Gasquett James et al.
David Keene, Receiver,
Appellant,
55 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt De Gasquett James et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Noble Hayes for the appellants; and concluded by Mr. Mansfield Ferry for the appellee James; and cases submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellee, Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

Thomas M. Livingston,
Appellant,
56 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ashby Williams for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Greene, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Kerkam, It is ordered that Loyd H. Sutton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Louis L. Dent, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that George M. LeCroy, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Flint Damon, It is ordered that Edward M. Ginsburg and Charles H. McClue, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Chin Set Wong, uncle and next friend of Chin Fook, Appellant,
188 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration at Boston, Massachusetts.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant in this cause has filed a motion to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas M. Livingston, Appellant,
56 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Ashby Williams for the appellant and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Eastern Transportation Company, Appellant,
57 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr. for the appellant, and by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the appellee.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Fong Hang Leong, Appellant,
59 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

This cause was argued by Mr. Everett Flint Damon for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellee.

The Liberty Warehouse Company et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
60 vs.
B. S. Grannis, as Commonwealth Attorney.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Allan D. Cole for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Pacific Power and Light Company,
Plaintiff in error,
84 vs.
L. D. Bayer, Pearl Durst, William H. Bucher, et al., etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Gray for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Pacific Power and Light Company,
Plaintiff in error,
84 vs.
L. D. Bayer, Pearl Durst, William H. Bucher, et al. etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Utah,
Appellant,
62 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore W. Heath, It is ordered that J. T. Manning, Jr. and J. Hamilton Chesson, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that Hober Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Homer R. Hendricks, Esquire, of Waxahachie, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Ralph E. Hoskot, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Peters, It is ordered that S. Fay Carr, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Morton Taylor Culver, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Utah,
Appellant,
62 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the appellant, by Mr. Ira E. Robinson for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the appellant.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
71 vs.
Pacific States Paper Trade Association, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., for the respondents.

John F. Jenkins,
Appellant,
64 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John D. Miller for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Appellant,
90 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted, pursuant to the twenty-third rule, by Mr. George Hublee and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

John F. Jenkins, Appellant,
64 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John D. Miller for the appellant and concluded by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the appellee.

Clarence H. Myers,
65 vs.
The Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

This cause was argued by Mr. George P. Lemm for Myers and by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

Chin Wey, Appellant,
66 vs.
Irving F. Wixon, [illegible] United

This cause was argued by Mr. Warren Ozro Kyle for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for

Quon Quon Poy,

Appellant,

68 vs.

John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Warren Ozro Kyle for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1926.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, It is ordered that Louden L. Bomberger and John W. Northland, Esquires, of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes. It is ordered that Elvin Swarthout, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper. It is ordered that Edmund P. Mahoney, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss, It is ordered that Ralph G. Lindstrom, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Sullivan, It is ordered that George A. Shutack, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur L. Jackson, It is ordered that Donald Fisher Lyberger, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A Reed, It is ordered that Francis Forrest Murray, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Faust, It is ordered that John B. McMahon, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Sam S. Haley, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Quon Quon Poy,

Appellant,

68 vs.

John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Warren Ozro Kyle for the appellant.

State of Missouri at the relation to and use of Wabash Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,

69 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and John A. Kurtz et al., etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Homer Hall and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the plaintiffs in error; by Mr. Oliver Senti for the defendants in error the City and Mayor of St. Louis, and by Mr. Marion C. Early for the defendant in error, Frank M. Gerhart.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1926 - CONTINUED.

Emmons Coal Mining Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
70 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. T. Manning, Jr., for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. Hamilton Cheston for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1926 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Douglass, It is ordered that Richard P. McCoun and William Townsend McCoun, Esquires, of Oyster Bay, State of New York, and Rowland Miles, Esquire, of Northport, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Edwin A. Olson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Frank E. Randall, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, and Edmund A. Prendergast, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. E. S. Wood, It is ordered that Emma Wold, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Donovan, It is ordered that Olin Wellborn, III, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Calvin T. Milan, It is ordered that Wilber Owen, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremiah M. O'Connell, It is ordered that Arthur L. Conaty, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Coulter Wells, It is ordered that George S. Ward, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Virginian Railway Company,

Appellant,

281 vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed as to matter appealed from on this appeal, as indicated by the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America and The
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
282 vs.
The Virginian Railway Company.

Cross-Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed as to matter appealed from on this cross-appeal, as indicated by the opinion of this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
95 vs.
George A. Storrs, Joseph S. Welch, et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John Carlton Dysart,
Petitioner,
102 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of

Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Ben F. Wright, Auditor for the Philippine Islands,

Petitioner,

316 vs.

Ynchausti and Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
In the matter of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

No.--Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry B. Stilz,

Appellant,

38 of the October Term 1925, vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beech-Nut Packing Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James W. Wuchter,
Plaintiff in error,
729 vs.
Michael Pizzutti.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. L. Evoland, Hugh Smith and B. W. Baer, Constituting The Tax Commission of the State of South Dakota,
Petitioners,
592 vs.
Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
State of Minnesota.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James McDonald, Jr., and James McDonald III, et al., etc.
Petitioners,
147 vs.
Lawrence Maxwell and Fulton Trust Company, executors.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft

D. Simonds, R. B. Edwards, and R. D. Kelly, in behalf of Themselves, etc. Plaintiffs in error,

500 vs.

The Town of Haskell, Oklahoma, F. M. Shoemake, as Town Clerk, etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and on motion to dismiss, affirm or advance, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edith Stege, William C. Dohrman(sometimes called W. C. Dohrman), Teresa L. Dohrman (sometimes called T. L. Dohrman), and P. H. McEvoy, Plaintiff in error,

41 vs.

City of Richmond and C. W. Cushing.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas M. Livingston, Appellant,

56 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Fong Hang Leong, Appellant,
59 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Utah,
Appellant,
62 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Jenkins,
Appellant,
64 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chin Woy,

Appellant,

66 vs.

Irving F. Wixon, Acting U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

727 vs.

John Hellstab, Judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

467 vs.

Sherman D. Hill, Administrator of the Estate of Thomas J. Hill, deceased.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
726 vs.
Harriet A. Bissett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
Vincenzo Cosmano,
Petitioner,
731 vs.
James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor and
W. J. Coyne, Inspector in Charge.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. C. Boorman, doing business under the name and style of the Twentieth Century Company and Lillian Menol,
Petitioners,
733 vs.
Edwards and Deutsch Lithographing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
266 vs.
James W. McElvain and Frank Crozier.

It is ordered that the opinion of this Court in this case, announced Monday, December 6 last, be, it is hereby, amended by changing the fourth sentence in the paragraph next to the last, to wit, "The language of the proviso can not reasonably be read to include conspiracy as defined by S. 37," so as to read as follows: "The language of the proviso can not reasonably be read to include all conspiracies defined by S. 37."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod and Kuhne,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
Patrick J. Carr, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, etc.

The death of Patrick J. Carr having been suggested and a motion to substitute George F. Harding, his successor in office as county treasurer and ex officio county collector of the County of Cook, State of Illinois, as the party defendant in error in this cause nunc pro tunc as of November 23, 1926, having been presented by Mr. F. C. Wells, per stipulation of counsel, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
357 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

On motion of Mr. Robert E. Coulson in behalf of Mr. John A. Garver and Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellee, the mandate in this case was granted.

Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York,
Appellant,
358 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

On motion of Mr. J. A. Dykman for the appellee, the mandate in this cause was granted.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Edwin C. Jameson, LeRoy W. Baldwin, Louis V. Bright et al.,
Petitioners.
--Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and for a rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mullin Woodward in behalf of Mr. Nathan L. Miller, Mr. Weymouth Kirkland, Mr. Robert K. Prentice, Mr. John Dickey, Jr., Mr. Girard C. Henderson, and Mr. Robert N. Golding in support of the motion, and by Mr. G. Carroll Todd in behalf of Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland, and Mr. William A. W. Stewart for the Guaranty Trust Company of New York and Merrell T. Callaway, as trustee, etc., et al, as amici curiae in opposition thereto.

City and County of Denver,
Appellant,
112 vs.
E. Stenger, as Receiver of the Denver Tramway Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of Myron H. Walker as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. Myron H. Walker and the motion was denied.

Ex parte:
In the matter of The City of New York, the Transit Commission, and John F. Gilchrist, et al., Constituting the Transit Commission et al.,
Petitioners,
--Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition and/or mandamus and/or certiorari was submitted to consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Conboy in behalf of Mr. George P. Nicholson, Mr. George H. Stover, Mr. Clarence M. Lewis, and Mr. William G. Fullen for the petitioners.

Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company et al.,
Petitioners
104 vs.
P. A. Cooke.

On motion of Mr. C. A. Farrell in that behalf leave was granted to file brief of Luther M. Walter for the National Industrial Traffic League as amicus curiae.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc.,

Petitioners,

609 vs.

Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lloyd C. Whitman and Mr. Bernhardt Frank for the petitioners.

Fidelity Bank and Trust Company of Kansas City, Standard Investment Company, Silas DeLap, et al,

Appellants,

46 vs.

Felix H. Swope and Gertrude M. Brown.

The death of Hunter M. Meriwether, one of the appellants herein having been suggested and a motion that this cause stand dismissed as to the said Hunter M. Meriwether, deceased, and that this action and the appeal herein proceed upon the appeal of the surviving appellants, Fidelity Bank and Trust Company, Standard Investment Company, Silas C. De Lap, and Gilmer Meriwether, having been presented by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, per stipulation of counsel, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

414 vs.

Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of Mr. Ralph M. Shaw for the Chicago Great Western Railroad Company; Mr. Silas H. Strawn for the Chicago and Alton Railroad Company; Mr. M. M. Joyce for the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railroad Company; Mr. C. C. Hine for the Chicago, Indianapolis, and Louisville Railway; Mr. W. H. Lyford for the Chicago and Eastern Railway Company; Mr. John L. Kirdall for the Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company; Mr. E. Randolph Williams for the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad Company; Messrs. Steiner, Crum and Weil for the Western Railway of Alabama; Mr. A. L. Burford for the Louisiana and Arkansas Railway; Mr. Eugene S. Williams for the Western Maryland Railway Company; and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the Great Northern Railway Company as amici curiae in this cause was submitted by Mr. F. G. Dorety in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles H. Bates for the Southern Pacific Company in opposition thereto, and the motion was denied.

Susan Lowe,

Petitioner,

158 vs.

Alexander J. Dickson.

The motion for a rule requiring the petitioner to show cause why there should not be furnished additional security under the supersedeas bonds herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Claude F. Street Piano Company, Roy Warden, Katherine D. Street, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

580 vs.

The City of Nashville, George J. Tompkins, J. W. Bauman, and Hilary E. House, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otis Reese,

Petitioner,

765 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otis Reese pro se.

Al Lau,

Petitioner,

728 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck and Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alexander Sidney Lanier for the respondent.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1926 - CONTINUED.

Hyman Schreeder, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Famous Fain Company, Inc., Bankrupt,

Petitioner,

730 vs.

Edward Howard O'Flyn.

for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Riegelman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Wingate

James G. Trainer,

Petitioner,

735 vs.

Darby A. Day.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Daniels for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas McCall for the respondent.

Fred A. Miller et al., Executors, etc.,

Plaintiffs in error,

73 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

Charles A. Miller et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

74 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

Emil T. Miller,

Plaintiff in error,

75 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

Harry G. John et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

76 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

These cases were argued by Mr. A. W. Schutz for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Walter J. Mattison for the defendant in error.

The Georgetown National Bank,

Plaintiff in error,

78 vs.

Ollie McFarland, Sheriff of Scott County, Kentucky, et al.

First National Bank of Hartford,

Plaintiff in error,

186 vs.

City of Hartford and State of Wisconsin.

The State of Minnesota,

Petitioner,

245 vs.

First National Bank of St. Paul.

These cases were argued by Mr. T. Kennedy Helm for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. Church Ford for the defendants in error in No. 78; by Mr. A. W. Fairchild for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E. J. Dempsey for the defendants in error in No. 186; by Mr. P. J. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien for the respondent in No. 245.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 3, 1927, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, It is ordered that Walter E. Hampton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Haveth E. Mau, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, It is ordered that Pedro Y. Ylagan, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jennings C. Wise, It is ordered that Ambrose E. Chambers, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Braussard, It is ordered that Moses C. Scharff, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar M. Kitchin, It is ordered that Harry C. Robb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, It is ordered that R. E. Seagler, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that H. A. Witousek, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Clark, It is ordered that J. M. Souby, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Thomas H. Gardiner, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that James A. Cosgrove, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Benton, it is ordered that E. W. Anderson, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John K. McGuire,

85 vs.

The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this Court that the second question certified should be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Butler.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company,

Appellant,

90 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjuged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America ex rel.

Emanuel Vajtauer,

Appellant,

111 vs.

The Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

W. T. Waggoner Estate and W. T. Waggoner, Appellants,
52 vs.
Wichita County and D. B. Sartin, H. H. Haynes, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Maguire and Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
39 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Liberty Warehouse Company and C. M. Jones, Trading, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
60 vs.
B. S. Crannis, as Commonwealth Attorney for the 19th Judicial District of Kentucky

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Wong Wai, alias Wong Sue Jun, alias Wong Wai,

Plaintiff in error,

79 vs.

The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Public Utilities Commission of Rhode Island and Narragansett Electric Lighting Company,

Petitioners,

217 vs.

Attleboro Steam and Electric Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

No. 6, Original.—October Term, 1926.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener.

[January 3, 1927.]

This cause having been heard and submitted under the counterclaim of the State of Texas, and the Court having considered the same and announced its conclusions in an opinion delivered October 11, 1926 [272 U. S.—], it is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows:

1. The boundary between the State of Texas and the State of Oklahoma constituting the eastern boundary of the Panhandle of Texas and the main western boundary of Oklahoma, is the line of the true one-hundredth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich, extending north from its intersection with the south bank of the South Fork of Red River to its intersection with the line of the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes north latitude.

2. Samuel S. Gannett, geodetic and astronomic engineer, is designated as commissioner to run, locate and mark the boundary between the two States as determined by this decree. In ascertaining and locating the line of said meridian the commissioner shall use the most accurate method now known to science and applicable in that locality; and he shall mark the boundary, as thus ascertained, by establishing permanent monuments thereon, suitably marked and at appropriate distances.

3. The commissioner shall include in his report a description of the monuments so established and of their locations. And he shall file with his report the field notes of his survey, showing the method used by him in ascertaining and locating the line of the meridian, and a map showing the boundary line as run and marked by him; also ten copies of his report and map.

4. Before entering upon his work the commissioner shall take and subscribe his oath to perform his duties faithfully and impartially. He shall prosecute the work with diligence and dispatch, and shall have authority to employ such assistants as may be needed therein; and he shall include in his report a statement of the work done, the time employed and the expenses incurred.

5. The work of the commissioner shall be subject in all its parts to the approval of the Court. One copy each of the commissioner's report and map shall be promptly transmitted by the clerk to the Governors of the two States and the Secretary of the Interior; and exceptions or objections to the commissioner's report, if there be such, shall be presented to the Court, or, if it be not in session, filed with the clerk, within forty days after the report is filed.

6. If, for any reason, there occurs a vacancy in the commission when the Court is not in session, the same may be filled by the designation of a new commissioner by the Chief Justice.

7. All the costs of executing this decree, including the compensation and expenses of the commissioner, shall be borne in three equal parts by the two States and the United States.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The State of Arkansas,

Complainant,

2, Original of October Term 1925. vs.

The State of Tennessee.

The application of C. B. Bailey, Charles A. Barton and Horace Van Deventer, constituting the boundary commission heretofore appointed by this Court, for leave to file their petition to have their compensation allowed is granted. And, on reading the petition, it is Ordered that the State of Arkansas, the State of Tennessee and each petitioner show cause,—by filing objections, if any there be, on or before January 20, 1927,—why the compensation of each petitioner for his service in this case should not be fixed at twenty-seven hundred dollars($2,700) and why judgment for one-half that amount should not be given in favor of each petitioner and against each State. Let a copy of this order be sent by mail to the Governor, the Attorney General and Solicitors of record of each of the States and also to each of the petitioners.

Giovanni Di Santo,

Plaintiff in error,

288 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Interstate Busses Corporation,

Appellant,

343 vs.

The Holyoke Street Railway Company, Major Beckman, Melvin Graves et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

71 vs.

Pacific States Paper Trade Association etc., et al.; Portland Paper Trade Association, etc., et al.; Spokane Paper and Stationery Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that that part of the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals which sets aside paragraphs (b) and (c) of the order of the Federal Trade Commission be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

State of Florida,

Complainant,

——,Orig. vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On rule to show cause why leave to file a bill of complaint should not be granted.

On consideration of the rule to show cause why leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause should not be granted, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered that the motion for leave to file bill be, and the same is hereby, denied, and the rule discharged.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Clarence H. Myers,

65 vs.

Hurley Motor Company, Inc.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question should be answered in the negative and the second question in the affirmative, with the qualification that the amount allowed defendant shall not exceed the amount of plaintiff's claim.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

A. J. Byars,

Petitioner,

72 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Henry Albrecht, Sr., Henry Albrecht, Jr., and Thomas Maher,

Plaintiffs in error,

9 vs.

The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be

Steamship "Willdomino," Her Engines, Boilers etc.,

Petitioner,

29 vs.

Citro Chemical Company of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Steamship "Willdomino", Her Engines, Boilers, etc.,

Petitioner,

30 vs.

Charles Pfizer and Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Heirs of Samuel Garland, Deceased,

Appellants,

42 vs.

The Choctaw Nation.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Sophia C. Pitchlynn and Others,
Heirs-at-Law of Peter P. Pitchlynn,
Deceased, Appellants,
43 vs.
The Choctaw Nation.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Pauline Andre de La Mettrie and
George Pratt de Casquet James,
Appellants,
54 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt de Casquet James,
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property
Custodian et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

David Keane, Receiver,
Appellant,
55 vs.
Elizabeth Pratt de Casquet James,
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property
Custodian et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this

cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

537 vs.

Samuel Gettinger and Harry Pomerantz, Trading under the firm name etc.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Emmons Coal Mining Company and the Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York,

Plaintiffs in error,

70 vs.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fred A. Miller and Elise K. John,
Executors of the Estate of Ernest G.
Miller, deceased,
Plaintiffs in error,
73 vs.
The City of Milwaukee.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Charles A. Miller and Clara A. Miller,
Plaintiffs in error,
74 vs.
The City of Milwaukee.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Emil P. Miller,

Plaintiff in error,

75 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Harry G. John and Elise K. John,

Plaintiffs in error,

76 vs.

The City of Milwaukee.

In error th the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Eastern Transportation Company,
Appellant,
57 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Postum Cereal Company, Incorporated,
Appellant,
22 vs.
California Fig Nut Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Los Angeles Brush Manufacturing Corporation,
--Original. vs.
William P. James, Judge, District Court of the United States, Southern District of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
In the matter of the City of New York, the Transit Commission, and John M. Gilchrist et al., etc., et al.
--Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of mandamus and/or prohibition and/or certiorari in this cause. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Edwin C. Jameson, Leroy V. Baldwin, Louis V. Bright, Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, and Thomas Read, Petitioners.
--Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otis Reese,
Petitioner,
765 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in this cause in forma pauperis. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otis Reese,
Petitioner,
765 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel V. Harkin et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
609 vs.
Edward J. Brumdage, Receiver, etc. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Susan Lowe,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

On consideration of the motion for a rule requiring the petitioner to furnish an additional bond herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mammoth Oil Company, Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Company and Sinclair Pipe Line Company,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Al Lau,

Petitioner,

728 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hyman Schroeder, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Famous Fain Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

730 vs.

Edward Howard O'Flyn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James G. Trainer,

Petitioner,

735 vs.

Darby A. Day.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Do Wing,

Appellant,

141 vs.

John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

the motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, in support of the motion.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
144 vs.
John A. Munroe.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States of America.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving partner, etc.,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Malcolm E. Nichols, as Collector of United States Internal Revenue,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Abram J. Rose in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief as amicus curiae in this cause.

Fox River Paper Company et al,
Plaintiffs in error,
492 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, Mr. C. A. Erikson, and Mr. Suel O. Arnold for the defendant in error.

Walter Nelson et al.,
Appellants,
416 vs.
W. C. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.
W. S. Cunningham et al.,
Appellants,
417 vs.
W. C. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

The motion to dismiss these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W. Anderson and Mr. John H. Dunbar for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edwin C. Ewing and Mr. W. R. Crawford for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
154 vs. Plaintiff in error,
. State of Oklahoma.

The motion to substitute the Oklahoma Natural Gas Corporation as successor of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as the party appellant in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. David A. Richardson for the appellant, Mr. George S. Short and Mr. J. Berry King for appellee, The State of Oklahoma, and Mr. E. S. Ratliff for appellee, The Corporation Commission of Oklahoma.

Seid Man, as next friend of Seid Wong,
Appellant,
189 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration at Boston, Massachusetts.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther, H. M. Hewitt, and Lew Menamaker,
Appellants,
372 vs.
William Duby, H. B. Van Duzer, and W. H. Malone, etc.

The motion to vacate the judgment in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, per stipulation by Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle, Mr. J. M. Devers, and Mr. Willis S. Moore for the appellees.

H. L. Eveland, Hugh Smith, and B. W. Baer, Constituting the Tax Commission of the State of South Dakota,

Petitioners,

592 vs.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay their own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. S. Rhodes,

Plaintiff in error,

708 vs.

State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morton S. Hawkins,

Petitioner,

782 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morton S. Hawkins pro se.

S. F. Larson,

Plaintiff in error

658 vs.

The State of Texas.

In error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George M. Dale,

Plaintiff in error,

656 vs.

The State of Indiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Knoxville Ice and Cold Storage Company and John F. Shea,

Plaintiffs in error,

666 vs.

City of Knoxville, B. A. Morton, Mayor, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Bobkowski, in behalf of Sabina Bobkowski, Josephine Bobkowski, et al.,

Petitioners,

732 vs.

Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Hidgely for the respondent.

Harry F. Sinclair,

Petitioner,

736 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Hoover, Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. J. W. Zevely, and Mr. G. T. Stanford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, Mr. Owen J. Roberts, and Mr. Peyton Gordon for the respondent.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

738 vs.

Herbert W. Boyle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. Magaw and Mr. M. H. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank L. McCoy for the respondent.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., owner, etc.,

Petitioner,

743 vs.

Union Oil Company of California, Claimant on behalf of itself and its Underwriters on the Steam Tanker, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Hasket Derby, Mr. Carroll Single, Mr. William Denman, Mr. William B. Acton, Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the respondents.

Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson, et al.,

Petitioners,

744 vs.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the respondents.

Chillicothe Furniture Company,
Petitioner,
745 vs.
Charles G. Revelle, Receiver of
Interstate Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy A. Thompson for the petitioner.

Broderick and Bascom Rope Company,
Petitioner,
746 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winter S. Martin for the petitioner.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
747 vs.
The Town of Morristown, Henry Laden, and others.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. Maximilian M. Stallman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the respondents.

C. C. Cate,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Pope Shepherd and Mr. Frank S. Garden for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Texas Pipe Line Company,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
J. L. Ware.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Zach Spearing for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
James M. Lee, alias James M. Leach.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alexander Sidney Lanier for the petitioner.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
753 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Wilson and Mr. John F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ben C. Dey and Mr. Alfred A Hampson for the respondent.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Wilson and Mr. John F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. James B. Kerr, and Mr. Charles A. Hart for the respondent.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
Oregon-Washington Railroad and Navigation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Wilson and Mr. John F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
Bert Hoge and Arthur L. Howe, Executors under the will of George Howe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Austin M. Pinkham

The Peter Schoenhofen Brewing Company, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The Alvey-Ferguson Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. Chritton, Mr. Russell Wiles, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jo. Baily Brown for the respondent.

Robert B. Hudson, a Judge of the District Court of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, Petitioner,
759 vs.
Vernon V. Harris, as Receiver of the Riverside Oil and Refining Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Dudley and Mr. J. D. Lydick for the respondents.

Odie Oland Owens, Petitioner,
760 vs.
Vernon V. Harris, as Receiver of the Riverside Oil and Refining Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Dudley and Mr. J. D. Lydick for the respondents.

Bank of Montreal, Petitioner,
762 vs.
Beacon Chocolate Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis L. Dent and Mr. Charles L. Freeman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mitchell D. Follansbee for the respondent.

Henderson Tire and Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Albert L. Reeves and Merrill E. Otis, Judges of the United States District Court, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the petitioner.

Jessie L. Wickwire, Individually and as Executrix and Trustee under the last will and testament of Edward L. Wickwire, deceased,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, as Collector and as Acting Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forest D. Siefkin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Frank D. Drake,
Petitioner,
767 vs.
Sarah Thompson, John R. Thompson, and Iowa Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Shuman and Mr. Matthew A. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. James J. Halligan for the respondents.

L. Anthony et al.,
Appellants,
314 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon.
I. S. Martins et al.,
Appellants,
373 vs.
Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon.

The motion to dismiss these cases was submitted, and these cases were submitted on briefs on their merits by Mr. Edwin C. Ewing and Mr. W. R. Crawford for the appellants, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle, Mr. J. M. Devers, and Mr. Willis S. Moore for the appellee.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
414 vs.
The Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant, the United States of America, and continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, it is ordered that Walter A. Hill, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest F. Mechlin, it is ordered that Towson Price and John Milton Jester, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, it is ordered that Harold H. Neff, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dan Moody, it is ordered that Wallace Hawkins, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Wurzbach, it is ordered that A. R. Mucks, Esquire, of Angleton, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Joseph E. Snowden, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert L. Davis, it is ordered that Holland Huntington, Esquire, of Tuscaloosa, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Urban C. Stover, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Horace K. Lamb, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President etc.,

Petitioner,

vs.

Wilbur K. Skinner.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

347

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent Designated by the President etc.,

Petitioner,

348 vs.

Victor H. Wilson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President etc.,

Petitioner,

349 vs.

Warren H. Bennison.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President etc.,

Petitioner,

350 vs.

Peter S. Stoneham.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin or Ben Harmon,

Plaintiff in error,

353 vs.

Joseph W. Tyler.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Zach Spearing for the defendant in error.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

414 vs.

Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for appellant, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Walter Nelson, Edwin Powell, John Hicks, et al., etc., et al.,

Appellants,

416 vs.

W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

W. S. Cunningham, Redmond Freight Company, H. Strain et al.,

Appellants,

417 vs.

W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants, and by Mr. John H. Dunbar and Mr. E. W. Anderson for the appellees.

L. A. Nixon,

Plaintiff in error,

117 vs.

C. C. Herndon and Charles Porras.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. C. Knollenberg and Mr. A. B. Spingarn for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error. Leave was granted Mr. Dan Moody to file a brief on behalf of the State of Texas within thirty days, with leave to plaintiff in error to file a reply thereto within two weeks thereafter.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

2, Original.

The State of Texas.

The argument on the exceptions to the master's report in this case was commenced by Mr. F. W. Clancy for the complainant, and continued by Mr. Thornton Hardie for the complainant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that Charles D. Council, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. D. Cochran, It is ordered that John W. Blue, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
2, Original.
The State of Texas.

The argument on the exceptions to the Master's report in this case was concluded by Mr. Dan Moody for the defendant.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
366 vs.
New York and Albany Lighterage Company.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
367 vs.
Lloyd W. Seaman.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
368 vs.
Thomas Staples Fuller.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
395 vs.
Solomon Noveck.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the defendant in error.

New York, Ontario and Western Railway Company, Appellant,
564 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. L. Andrus for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

T. L. Smith, Sr., T. L. Smith, Jr., The Texas Company, et al., Appellants,
648 vs.
Louis J. Wilson, E. C. Tobey, George E. Badge, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael D. Manley, It is ordered that David O. Dunbar, Esquire, of Wheaton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Frederick W. Hinckley, Esquire, of South Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Gardner, It is ordered that Frederick G. Lisius and George E. Hershman, Esquires of Crown Point, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey, It is ordered that Dorsey W. Kellogg, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Executors of the Will of Julia Coolidge.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Peter H. Holme leave was granted to file a brief of Mary Dean Reed, as Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of Verner Zevola Reed, deceased, as amicus curiae.

T. L. Smith, Sr., T. L. Smith, Jr., The Texas Company, et al.,
Appellants,
648 vs.
Louis J. Wilson, E. C. Tobey, George E. Badge, et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. A. H. Hucks for the appellees.

R. Burney Long,
Plaintiff in error,
472 vs.
State of Louisiana.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. C. Scharff for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company,
Appellants,
61 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

Jacob Reed's Sons, Inc.,
Appellant,
63 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
80 vs.
Levy Hall.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry H. Smith for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Walter J. Gex for the defendant in error.

The Davis Sewing Machine Company,
Appellant,
82 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Max Siff and Albert L. Siff, Trading as Siff Brothers Company,
Appellants,
83 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Executors of the Will of Julia Coolidge.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas H. Lewis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel O. Edmonds, it is ordered that Lawrence Bristol, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wellmore B. Turner, it is ordered that Rolla M. Galloway, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel. Norwegian Nitrogen Products Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
The United States Tariff Commission, et al.

This cause was continued on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of counsel.

The Barrett Company, Appellant,
105 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King and Mr. William B. King for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, with leave to the appellee to file brief by January 8.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Executors of the Will of Julia Coolidge.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, leave was granted to file a brief of Russell L. Bradford on behalf of the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company as trustee under a trust indenture made by William Waldorf Astor on May 25, 1916, as amicus curiae.

Jacob M. Dickinson, Receiver, etc.,
Appellant,
106 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed, and the case assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th next, on motion of Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge et al., Executors, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas H. Lewis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the defendant in error.

The State of Ohio ex rel. K. B. Allen,
Plaintiff in error,
89 vs.
Joseph A. Lutz, as Auditor of Montgomery County, Ohio.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl H. Turner and Mr. Wellmore B. Turner for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ralph E. Hoskot for the defendant in error.

The Mosler Safe Company,
Petitioner,
94 vs.
Ely-Norris Safe Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Owen Edmonds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lawrence Bristol for the respondent.

The United States ex rel. The Charles McCaul Company,

Plaintiff in error,

97 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Daniel G. Moore, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Hickey, It is ordered that Stanley Myers and Leon W. Behrman, Esquires, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court,and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, it is ordered that Floyd Gilbert Blair, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Walter M. Van Hort, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles N. Burch, It is ordered that Edward H. Cabaniss, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Hampton, It is ordered that Fred J. Hampton, Esquire, of Gainesville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick H. Lotterhos, It is ordered that David Clay Bramlette, Esquire, of Woodville, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Reid, It is ordered that Hudson P. Hibbard, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Frank T. McCoy, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel, It is ordered that Theodore I. Schwartzman, Esquire, of Long Beach, State of New York, and Nathan April, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carter W. Wesley, It is ordered that J. Alston Atkins, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Missouri at the Relation
to and use of Wabash Railway Company
and Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific
Railway Company,

Plaintiff in error,

69 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri
and John A. Kurtz, E. J. Bean et al.,
etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court
of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

James-Dickinson Farm Mortgage Com-
pany and A. D. Dickinson,

Plaintiffs in error,

40 vs.

Carrie M. Harry.

In error to the District Court
of the United States for the
Eastern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs as to James-Dickinson Farm Mortgage Company, and affirmed as to A. D. Dickinson; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company, Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next, on the Summary Docket, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving Partner, etc., Petitioner,
531 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 28th next, on the Summary Docket, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox River Paper Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
492 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin or Ben Harmon, Plaintiff in error,
353 vs.
Joseph W. Tyler.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 7 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther, H. M. Hewitt and Lew Menamaker,

Appellants,

372 vs.

Wm. Duby, H. B. Van Duzer and W. H. Malone, etc.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the decree of this Court, heretofore entered in this cause on October 29, 1926, It is ordered that such decree be, and it is hereby, vacated, and the cause is set for reargument on Monday, February 28th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Do Wing,

Appellant,

141 vs.

John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr.,

Plaintiff in error,

739 vs.

The State of Florida.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in this cause in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted. And It is further ordered that the Clerk be directed to have the record herein printed forthwith and to pay the costs hereof, as well as the costs already incurred herein, from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morton S. Hawkins,

Petitioner,

782 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morton S. Hawkins,

Petitioner,

782 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. Anthony, Alert Transfer and Storage Company, Inc., G. T. Hines, et al., etc., et al.,

Appellants,

314 vs.

Sam. A. Kozer, Secretary of State.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. S. Martine, M. C. Yahne, Fred Gordon, et al.,

373 vs.

Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State of Oregon.

Appellants,

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Nelson, Edwin Powell, John Hicks, et al., etc., et al.,

Appellants,

416 vs.

W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. S. Cunningham, Redmond Freight Company, H. Strain et al.,

Appellants,

417 vs.

W. G. Potts, Treasurer of the State of Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed

New York, Ontario and Western Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission. 564 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. Burney Long, Plaintiff in error, vs. State of Louisiana. 472 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Levy Hall. 80 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Siff and Albert L. Siff, Trading as Siff Bros. Company,

Appellants,

83 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel. E. B. Allen,

Plaintiff in error,

89 vs.

Joseph A. Lutz, as Auditor of Montgomery County.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. The Chas. McCaul Company,

Plaintiff in error,

97 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson, et al.,
Petitioners,
744 vs.
Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Steamship "Newport", her engines, etc., J. McKinnon, Master, etc.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
747 vs.
The Town of Morristown, Henry Laden, and others.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
James M. Lee, alias James M. Leach.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jessie L. Wickwire, Individually and as Executrix and Trustee under the Last Will and Testament of Edward L. Wickwire, Deceased.

Petitioner,

764 vs.

Mabel G. Heinecke, as Collector and as Acting Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Bobkowski, in behalf of Sabina Bobkowski, Josephine Bobkowski, et al.,

Petitioners,

732 vs.

Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Sinclair,

Petitioner,

736 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
Herbert W. Boyle.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., owner of the Steamship "Walter A. Luckenbach",
Petitioner,
743 vs.
Union Oil Company of California, Claimant on behalf of itself and its Underwriters on the Steam Tanker, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chillicothe Furniture Company,
Petitioner,
745 vs.
Charles G. Revelle, Receiver of Interstate Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Broderick and Bascom Rope Company,
Petitioner,
746 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Cate,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas Pipe Line Company,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
J. L. Ware.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
753 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Lothrop,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
Bert Rose and Arthur L. Rowe, Executors under the Will of George Rowe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Peter Schoenhofen Brewing Company, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The Alvey-Ferguson Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert B. Hudson, as Judge of the District Court of Tulsa, County, Oklahoma, Petitioner,
759 vs.
Vernon V. Harris, as Receiver of the Riverside Oil and Refining Company, J. B. Dydley and J. D. Lydick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Odie Oland Owens,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Vernon V. Harris, as Receiver of the Riverside Oil and Refining Company, J. B. Dydley and J. D. Lydick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bank of Montreal,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
Beacon Chocolate Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henderson Tire and Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Albert L. Reeves and Merrill E. Otis, Judges of the United States District Court, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank D. Drake,
Petitioner,
767 vs.
Sarah Thompson, John R. Thompson, and Iowa Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Appellant,

802 vs.

Huron Navigation Company.

On Cross-Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has filed a motion to dismiss the cross-appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cross-appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Chin Wing Dip,

Appellant,

133 vs.

John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

The motion to affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Everett Flint Damon for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

697 vs.

Moritz Neuberger.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to remand this cause to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with instructions to dismiss the original petition for naturalization therein on the ground that the question involved has been rendered moot through the admission of the respondent to citizenship on to-wit

December 20, 1926, on a new petition for naturalization filed September 1, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Chin Wing Dip,

Appellant,

133 vs.

John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

The motion to remand this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Flint Damon for the appellant.

In the Matter of Disbarment of Sidney A. Schwartz.

The Grievance Committee of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia having filed a petition showing that Sidney A. Schwartz was disbarred from further practice as a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and praying the issuance of a rule requiring the said Sidney A. Schwartz to show cause before this Court, why he should not be disbarred from further practice as a member of the Bar of this Court, and praying that the said Sidney A. Schwartz be suspended from practice pending the further order of this Court;

And upon consideration of which petition a rule was issued on November 29, 1926, requiring the said Sidney A. Schwartz to show cause before this Court, on or before Monday, January 3, 1927, why the prayer of the petition should not be granted, and ordering that the said Sidney A. Schwartz be suspended from practice as a member of the Bar of this Court pending the further order of this Court;

And it now appearing to the Court that the date upon which the said rule was returnable has passed and that no cause has been shown by the said Sidney A. Schwartz;

Therefore, it is now here ordered by this Court, upon motion of Hugh B. Rowland, Esquire, on behalf of the Grievance Committee of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, that the said Sidney A. Schwartz be, and he is hereby, disbarred from membership in the Bar of this Court and that the Clerk of this Court is directed to strike the name of the said Sidney A. Schwartz from the roll of Attorneys admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Shawnee Gas and Electric Company, et al.

The motion to substitute the Oklahoma Natural Gas Corporation as successor of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as the party plaintiff in error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in that behalf.

Lucey Manufacturing Corporation,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Malcolm F. Morlan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark and Mr. Albert H. Crutcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar Lawler for the respondent.

F. H. Mason,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
C. F. Houtzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. M. Jett and Mr. Horace Andrews for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

Arturo Mendez,
Petitioner,
773 vs.
Justices Bingham, Anderson, and Johnson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Felix Cordova Davila for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondents.

Frank Sofge,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
John W. Snook, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hooper Alexander and Mr. Thomas W. Hardwick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Utah Construction Company et al.,
Petitioners,
777 vs.
United States of America for the use and benefit of H. Lindstrom et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. M. Aikens for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. W. Hutton, Mr. Herman Phleger, and Mr. Fletcher G. Flaherty for the respondents.

Lucy Fisher, James Charles, Ellen Stake, nee Charles et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
110 vs.
C. J. Crider.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.

Charleston, South Carolina, Mining and Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
93 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. William Wade Hampton for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

W. C. Begley,
Plaintiff in error,
98 vs.
Alice Krasimo.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Cleon K. Calvert, leave was granted to file a brief of Alice Krasimo, the defendant in error, pro se. This cause was argued by Mr. Cleon K. Calvert for the plaintiff in error.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1927 - CONTINUED.

The United States,
Appellant,
100 vs.
Burton Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellant, and by Mr. Maclay Hoyne for the appellee.

Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company, et al.
Petitioners,
104 vs.
F. A. Cooke.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry McCall and Mr. Charles N. Burch for the petitioners, and by Mr. Fred H. Letterhos for the respondent.

Byron Dunn and Robert Dunn,
Plaintiffs in error,
644 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. C. Adams for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. The cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on application for writ of certiorari by Mr. M. C. Adams for the plaintiffs in error in support of the application, and by Mr. John J. Robira for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Frederick L. Miller,
Plaintiff in error,
512 vs.
The State of Oregon.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward W. Wickey for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Ralph W. Bilby, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Edmund S. Kochersperger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Barnard, It is ordered that Frederick W. Piper, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Semmes, It is ordered that William Douglas Arant, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson, It is ordered that Henry E. May, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

City and County of Denver,
Appellant,
112 vs.
E. Stenger, as Receiver of the Denver Tramway Company.

On motion of Mr. Thomas H. Gibson in that behalf, the brief of Myron H. Walker, as amicus curiae, filed as a supplemental brief on behalf of the appellant, was ordered to be withdrawn.

Thomas M. Adams,
Appellant,
114 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

W. H. Donham, as Prosecuting Attorney for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of the State of Arkansas et al.,
Appellants,
118 vs.
West-Nelson Manufacturing Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Utley, Mr. William T. Hammock, and Mr. Brooks Hays for the appellants, and by Mr. George A. McConnell for the appellee.

Frederick L. Miller,
Plaintiff in error,
512 vs.
State of Oregon.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward W. Wickey for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,
Petitioner,
511 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. C. Reid and Mr. H. P. Hibbard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in error,
107 vs.
E. W. Porter and D. S. Weaver, doing business, etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas T. Railey, Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. E. B. Kinsworthy, and Mr. Robert E. Wiley for the plaintiff

Minverva Jones et al., etc., et al.,
Appellants,
109 vs.
The Prairie Oil and Gas Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. A. Atkins and Mr. Carter W. Wesley for the appellants, and by Mr. J. L. Hull for the appellee.

City and County of Denver,
Appellant,
112 vs.
E. Stenger, as Receiver of the Denver Tramway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Shelton, it is ordered that Fred A. Woodis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Clifford B. Longley, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, and Raymond E. Watson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

People of the State of New York ex rel. International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in error,
128 vs.
State Tax Commission.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

City and County of Denver, Appellant,
112 vs.
E. Stenger, as Receiver of The Denver Tramway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas R. Gibson and Mr. Henry E. May for the appellant, and by Mr. Gerald Hughes for the appellee.

Louisiana and Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error, 120 vs. John B. Gardiner.	This cause was argued by Mr. Harry McCall for the plaintiff in error. No appearance for the defendant in error.
A. J. Thigpen and A. J. Thigpen, Jr., Plaintiffs in error, 121 vs. Midland Oil Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank McCoy for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Samuel A. Myers and Harry Myers, copartners as S. A. and H. Myers, Petitioners, 122 vs. International Trust Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward K. McClennen for the petitioners and continued by Mr. John M. Lasenby for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that L. R. Weinmann, Esquire, of Alameda, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Baldwin, it is ordered that Frederick M. DeNeffe, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney an Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, it is ordered that Clifford K. Pullen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Samuel A. Myers and Harry Myers, co-partners as S. A. and H. Myers,
Petitioners,
122 vs.
International Trust Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John H. Lazenby for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioners.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
123 vs.
Shelby Iron Company of New Jersey and
Shelby Iron Company of Alabama.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gardiner P. Lloyd for the appellant, and by Mr. E. H. Cabaniss for the appellees. On motion of Mr. E. H. Cabaniss in that behalf leave was granted to file an additional brief for the appellee within ten days.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert D. Dodge, It is ordered that John M. Raymond, and Paul F. Perkins, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that James F. Meagher, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Leo W. Simon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter A. Brown, It is ordered that Jerome M. Cox, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Dodge, It is ordered that Frederick Backmann, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William C. Atwater and Company, Incorporated,
Appellant,
132 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the defendant in error.

Fred T. Ley and Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
125 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Frank C. Mebane, as Receiver of Symes Foundation, Inc., and American Title and Trust Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
126 vs.
Staten Island Railway Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hugh H. O'Bear for the plaintiff in error, Symes Foundation, Inc., and continued by Mr. Benjamin Catchings for the plaintiff in error, Frank C. Mebane, as Receiver, etc. The Court declined to hear further argument.

H. E. Smyer and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company,
Appellants,
131 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. J. Smyer for the appellants, and by Mr. Gardiner P. Lloyd for the appellee.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1927 - CONTINUED.

Oregon Basin Oil and Gas Company,
Appellant,
129 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 17th next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton Brylawski, It is ordered that Arthur E. Mixel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that H. Lester Moore, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, and Walter G. Moyle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael J. Colbert, It is ordered that Benjamin D. Friedman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Marshall, It is ordered that Carl G. Bachmann, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court , and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that George C. Ober, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Mac C. Barnes, Jr., It is ordered that James M. Snee, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Edward J. Callahan, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. DeLacy, It is ordered that William C. De Lacy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that Arthur Schramm, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that Edward L. McDonald, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Moses B. Lairy, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Great Northern Railway Company and
Central Union Trust Company of New York,

Appellants,

53 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Sanford.
Mr. Justice Stone.

John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant at Arms of The United States Senate,

Appellant,

28 vs.

Mally S. Daugherty.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

The Mosler Safe Company,
Petitioner,
94 vs.
Ely-Norris Safe Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Ex parte:
Vincent I. Whitman, Bernard G. Whitman, and Irvin A. Whitman,
Petitioners,
--Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Damon ex rel. Chin Wing Dip,
Appellant,
133 vs.
John P. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District Of Massachusetts, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and on motions to affirm and remand, which were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy Fisher, James Charles, Allen Stake, nee Charles et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

110 vs.

E. J. Crider.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. C. Begley,

Plaintiff in error,

98 vs.

Alice Krasimo.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company and Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company,

Petitioners,

104 vs.

F. A. Cocke.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Byron Dunn and Robert Dunn,

Plaintiffs in error,

644 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Byron Dunn and Robert Dunn,

Plaintiffs in error,

644 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick L. Miller,

Plaintiff in error,

512 vs.

State of Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. H. Donham, as Prosecuting Attorney for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of the State of Arkansas; T. A. Wilson, I. N. Makdimen, et al., etc., et al., Appellants,

118 vs.

West-Nelson Manufacturing Company

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

City and County of Denver,
Appellant,
112 vs.
E. Stenger, as Receiver of the Denver Tramway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit under the authority of the Act of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Thigpen and A. J. Thigpen, Jr.,
Plaintiffs in error,
121 vs.
Midland Oil Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Thigpen and A. J. Thigpen, Jr., Plaintiffs in error,
121 vs.
Midland Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
124 vs.
State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Mebane, as Receiver of Symes Foundation, Inc., and American Title and Trust Company, Plaintiff in error,
126 vs.
Staten Island Railway Company, Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, New York Transit and Terminal Company et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. H. Mason,

Petitioner,

770 vs.

C. F. Houtzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucey Manufacturing Corporation,

Petitioner,

761 vs.

Malcolm F. Merlan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arturo Mendez,

Petitioner,

773 vs.

Justices Bingham, Anderson and Johnson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Sofge,

Petitioner,

774 vs.

John W. Snook, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Utah Construction Company and The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Petitioners,

777 vs.

United States of America for the use and benefit of H. Lindstrom et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Duignan,

Appellant,

101 vs.

The United States of America et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday February 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. J. Eiseman and Alexander H. Abrams, Plaintiffs in error,
722 vs.
The People of the State of California.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th, be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Holmes Ives and M. J. Whelan, Plaintiffs in error,
723 vs.
The People of the State of California.

Fairmont Creamery Company, Plaintiff in error,
725 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr., Plaintiff in error,
739 vs.
The State of Florida.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob M. Dickinson, Receiver etc., Appellant,
106 vs.
The United States.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, January 24th, be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 24th, until Monday, February 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error,
160 vs.
American Refining Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiff in error has filed a motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Refining Company, Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.
The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the defendant in error, has confessed error in this cause, and moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the said District Court and remand the cause to the said District Court for further proceedings;

Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, and motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Twin City Forge and Foundry Company, Appellant,
134 vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf.

State of Missouri at the relation to and use of Wabash Railway Company and Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

69 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri et al., etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Oliver Senti for the defendants in error, the mandate in this cause was granted. X

Orla Rubsamin, individually and as Receiver, etc.,

Petitioner,

778 vs.

Carl H. Schultz, a corporation, et al.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari nunc pro tunc was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Steckler for the petitioner.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

507 vs.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. James S. Y. Ivins in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the Boston and Maine Railroad as amicus curiae.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,

Petitioner,

791 vs.

Milton Dairy Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. J. M. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Haydn S. Cole for the respondent.

The Celluloid Company,

Plaintiff in error,

665 vs.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiff in error has filed a motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Helene A. Kny, Sole Executrix of the Estate of Richard Kny, deceased, Appellant,
152 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Propery Custodian and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Basin Oil and Gas Company, Appellant,
129 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the appellant.

Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
136 vs.
Donald Page et al., Administrators of the estate of Michael S. Ryan, deceased.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles P. Perkins for the respondent.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Joseph J. Luechtefeld and F. William Kuehl, Plaintiffs in error
137 vs.
Henry W. Kiel, Louis Notte, and Oliver Senti.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luke E. Hart for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT;

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Lee, It is ordered that John F. Rhodes, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, It is ordered that Samuel E. Darby, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Mac C. Barnes, Jr., It is ordered that Mathieu M. Proujansky, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Winfield Scott, Esquire, of Enid, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson, It is ordered that Cornelius A. Parker, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Joseph J. Luechtefeld and F. William Kuehl, Plaintiffs in error,
137 vs.
Henry W. Kiel, Louis Notte, and Oliver Senti.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Luke E. Hart for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Industrial Engineering Company, Appellant,
138 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
507 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. White for the respondent.

Bedford Cut Stone Company et al., Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt and Mr. Daniel Davenport for the petitioners, and by Mr. Moses H. Lairy for the respondents.

E. A. Edenfield, Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. W. Larson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, it is ordered that Charles F. Creal, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, it is ordered that Walter Wyatt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Mac Williams, it is ordered that Weldon A. Dayton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

E. A. Edenfield,
Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. W. Larsen for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
669 vs.
Leib Mitterman.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Mac C. Barnes, Jr. for the respondent.

Robert David Kercheval, etc.,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward J. Callahan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Arthur Maul,
Petitioner,
655 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nathan April for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, Sr., It is ordered that Samuel M. Shortridge, Jr., Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Albert L. Reed, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Huron Navigation Corporation,
Appellant,
153 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims
The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per. Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error, 154 vs. The State of Oklahoma.	This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel
Arthur Maul, Petitioner, 655 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Nathan April for the petitioner, and concluded by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.
A. L. Ferguson and A. L. Ferguson, as Executor and Trustee, etc., et al., Appellants, 139 vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
De Forest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company, Appellant, 142 vs. The United States.	This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.
James McDonald, Jr., and James McDonald, III, and Alexander McDonald Infants, etc., Petitioners, 147 vs. Lawrence Maxwell and Fulton Trust Company, Executors.	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles V. Imlay for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. E. Haymond, It is ordered that Henry Davis, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Sears, It is ordered that Ella Cramer Kindred and John J. Kindred, Esquire, of De Land, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court,and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, It is ordered that Joseph F. Lockett, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Max Weksler,

Plaintiff in error.

165 vs.

Morgan G. Collins, Superintendent of Police, et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Sam G. Bratton, leave was granted to withdraw the appearance of Mr. Joseph G. Slottow as counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Ben E. Hayman,

Appellant,

155 vs.

City of Galveston, Bayliss E. Harris, J. E. Pearce, et al., etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Simmons for the appellant. No brief filed for the appellees.

Swiss Oil Corporation,

Plaintiff in error,

148 vs.

William H. Shanks, Auditor of Public Accounts for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. Owsley Stanley for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles F. Creal for the defendant in error.

Wallace R. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, et al.,

Petitioners,

465 vs.

T. Tokushige, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William B. Lymer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph Lightfoot for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Kenneth Dayton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Harold S. Deming, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that James L. Madden and Kenneth M. Parkinson, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, It is ordered that William H. Hudgins, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, it is ordered that Samuel Louis Shore, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, it is ordered that Robert Robsinson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Joseph H. McCoole, Esquire, of Dedham, State of Massachusetts, and Declan W. Corcoran, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Eugene D. Bennett, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Elliott, it is ordered that Oscar E. Buder and Gustavus A. Buder, Jr., Esquires, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Hastings, it is ordered that John Rogers, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and Hubert Ambrister, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Jacob Reed's Sons, Inc.,

Appellant,

63 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
395 vs.
Solomon Novack.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Minerva Jones, Philip A. Lewis,
and Carter W. Wesley, Trustees etc.,
et al.,
Appellants,
109 vs.
The Prairie Oil and Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Orla Hubsamin, individually and as
Receiver etc.,
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Carl H. Schultz, a corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1927.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of certiorari nunc pro tunc in this cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied;

And it is further ordered that the petition for certiorari already filed in this cause be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the files.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,

Petitioner,

791 vs.

Milton Dairy Company.

Order Allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas,

Complainant,

of October Term, 1925
2, Original / vs.

The State of Tennessee

On consideration of the objections to the order of this Court entered nisi January 3, 1927, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said order of January 3, 1927, be, and the same is hereby, made absolute.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Joseph J. Luechtefeld and F. William Kuehl,

Plaintiffs in error,

137 vs.

Henry W. Kiel, Louis Motte and Oliver Senti.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Industrial Engineering Company,

Appellant,

138 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. A. Edenfield, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

276 vs. the Fifth Circuit.

The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals , in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, for a resentence on the first count of each of the three indictments.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. L. Ferguson and A. L. Ferguson,

as Executor and Trustee, etc., et

al., etc., Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

139 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Basin Oil and Gas Company,

Appellant,

129 vs.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

No. 752. The United States, petitioner, vs. James M. Lee, alias James M. Leach.

No. 766. C. O. Westfall, vs. the United States.

No. 771. W. I. Biddle, as Warden etc., vs. Vuco Perovich.

No. 794. Will Morris, plaintiff in error, vs. State of Louisiana.

No. 811. Frank W. Keeler, plaintiff in error, vs. Stanley Myers, as District Attorney, etc., et al.

No. 812. Frank Weeks, plaintiff in error, vs. The United States.

No. 827. Ellsworth Kelley, plaintiff in error, vs. State of Oregon.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases upon the docket, be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, March 7th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

It is now here ordered by this Court that Section 7 of Rule 29 of this Court be amended by striking therefrom the words "ten cents per folio of each one hundred words", in the clause prescribing fees for preparing records, etc., and substituting the words "eight cents per folio of each one hundred words", so that the entire clause will read:

"For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies

to the Justices, the Reporter, the Law Library, and the parties or their counsel, eight cents per folio of each one hundred words; but where the necessary printed copies of the record as printed for the use of the court below are furnished, charges under this item will be limited to any additions printed here under the Clerk's supervision."

This order shall apply to causes filed here on or after February 1, 1927, but not to causes filed prior to that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel O'Neill, Harry Levin, and Morris Multin,

Petitioner,

784 vs.

The United States of America.

Michael Whalen,

Petitioner,

785 vs.

The United States of America.

Nathan Goldstein,

Petitioner,

786 vs.

The United States of America.

Harry F. Stratton,

Petitioner,

787 vs.

The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted the respondent to file a brief within ten days.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company et al.,

Petitioners,

577 vs.

E. B. Spiller et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. S. Bailey in behalf of Mr. S. H. Cowan, Mr. John S. Leay, and Mr. Walter H. Saunders for the respondents.

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1927 - CONTINUED.

Will Morris,
Plaintiff in error,
794 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. A. Owsley Stanley in behalf of Mr. George Wesley Smith for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file the statement of points to be relied upon and designation of the parts of the record to be printed.

Willie Conner and John Conner,
Plaintiffs in error,
176 vs.
H. U. Bartlett, E. G. Bailey, McMann Oil Company et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Rogers and Mr. Hubert Ambrister in behalf of Mr. W. H. Francis, Mr. B. B. Blakeney, and Mr. L. O. Lytle for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom et Cie, Societe Anonyme,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
Gulf Export and Transportation Company.

The motion to require the petitioner to furnish security was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Curtis House for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry S. Gray for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Gustavus A. Buder and Oscar E. Buder,
Petitioners,
846 vs.
Ehrhardt W. Frans.

The motion to stay further proceedings in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri pending action on the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Buder for the petitioners.

Daniel O'Neill, Harry Levin and Morris Multin,

Petitioners,

784 vs.

The United States of America.

Michael Whalen,

Petitioner,

785 vs.

The United States of America.

Nathan Goldstein,

Petitioner,

786 vs.

The United States of America.

Harry F. Stratton,

Petitioner,

787 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Rowe, Jr., and Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioners.

The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

788 vs.

Marion Wiggins, Individually and as Executrix and Trustee under the will of W. B. Wiggins, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. James B. Kerr, and Mr. Charles A. Hart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the respondent.

Hagop Bogigian,

Petitioner,

789 vs.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County of the State of Massachusetts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hagop Bogigian, Mr. W. B. Grant, and Mr. Henry M. Whittemore for the petitioner.

Helen J. C. Bogigian,
Petitioner,
790 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County of the State of Massachusetts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Helen J. C. Bogigian, Mr. W. B. Grant, and Mr. Henry E. Whittemore for the petitioner.

George N. Konsoute,
Petitioner,
792 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Thomas Hoffman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, and Mr. Robert D. Dalzell for the respondent.

State of Washington ex rel. Isadore R. Edelstein,
Petitioner,
795 vs.
William A. Huneke, Judge of the Superior Court of Spokane County.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Turner and Mr. Richard W. Nuzum for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. M. Driver for the respondent.

Jacob Telfair Smith,
Petitioner,
796 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James K. Symmers and Mr. John C. Prizer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Catz American Shipping Company, Inc., Petitioner,
797 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James K. Symmers and Mr. John C. Prizer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent..

The Buckeye Traction Ditcher Company, Petitioner,
798 vs.
The Austin Machinery Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilber Owen for the petitioner.

S. M. Goriab, Petitioner,
799 vs.
Charles D. Fox, et al., members of the City Council of Roanoke, Virginia, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. A. Wingfield for the petitioner.

Southern Industrial Institute, Petitioner,
800 vs.
Mrs. Burnham S. Marsh, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel MacDougald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 801 vs. W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading as Henry Marcus and Son.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Hudgins for the respondents.
Ida T. Dickinson, Luella J. Manning, Ellsworth Avery, et al., Petitioners, 803 vs. New England Power Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Heman H. Field for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank W. Knowlton for the respondent.
The Barker Painting Company, Petitioner, 805 vs. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Gray for the respondents.
Dampskibs Aktieselsk Orient, claimant of the Danish Steamship Natal, her Engines, etc., Petitioner, 806 vs. W. R. Grace and Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving H. Frank, Mr. Nathan H. Frank, Mr. O. D. Duncan, and Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Orrick for the respondent.

George Gracie,

Petitioner,

810 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel T. Hagan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

821 vs.

William H. Muller and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Ralph Robinson, and Mr. Shirley Carter for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. M. Lee Marshall for the respondent.

Anna Nelson,

Plaintiff in error,

842 vs.

J. L. Walrod, S. M. Ellsworth and C. W. Burnham.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 21st next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that Walter Brower and Frank Bainbridge, Esquires, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Edward H. Wilson, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Bramhall, It is ordered that Herbert H. Patterson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Joseph Francis O'Brien, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo V. Morgan, It is ordered that Robert Muark, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Thomas B. Ross, Esquire, of McCormick, State of South Carolina; Robert E. Freer, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, and Lloyd B. Harrison, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. Chantland, It is ordered that Clifton G. Dyer, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that Alfred J. Talley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Reid, It is ordered that Cassius Poust, Esquire, of Sycamore, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that George E. Trowbridge, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Kerkam, It is ordered that Richard D. Myre, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Lee B. Kemon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick M. Gibbs, it is ordered that Eugene J. McGivney, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Adelin, It is ordered that Philip S. Peyser, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clinton Hobb, It is ordered that Herbert S. Avery, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. M. La Saner, It is ordered that W. T. Henry, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bert M. Parmenter, it is ordered that Arch M. Parmenter, Esquire, of Lawton, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland, It is ordered that William Kent Clute, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, and Edward N. Barnard, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that Leonard A. Flansburg, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton, It is ordered that Charles E. Phillips, Esquire, of Mankato, State of Minnesota, and Albert Fuller Pratt, Esquire, of Anoka, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allen MacCullen, It is ordered that Richmond J. Reese, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel H. Richards, It is ordered that Floyd H. Bradley, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, It is ordered that George G. Chandler and Edward H. Cushman, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Farnum, It is ordered that Samuel L. Webb and O. Walker Taylor, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, It is ordered that Samuel Goldstein, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York; Moses H. Koenig, Benjamin Koenigsberg, and Herman Koenigsberg, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, and Morris Sternfield, Esquire, of Richmond Hill, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that Abraham Feit, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fred T. Ley and Company, Inc.,

Appellant,

136 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

T. L. Smith, Sr., T. L. Smith, Jr.,
The Texas Company et al.,

Appellants,

648 vs.

Louis J. Wilson, E. C. Robey, George M. Badge et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

27 vs.

The Trenton Potteries Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York

reinstated, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Butler.
Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Swiss Oil Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
148 vs.
William H. Shanks, Auditor of Public Accounts for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.
In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Ben K. Hayman,
Appellant,
155 vs.
City of Galveston, Bayliss E. Harris, J. K. Pearce, et al., etc.
Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Quon Quon Poy,

Appellant,

68 vs.

John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of Boston, Massachusetts.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, nunc pro tunc as of December 10, 1926.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York, Plaintiff in error,

6 vs.

Southern Photo Materials Company.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Samuel A. Myers and Harry Myers, Copartners as S. A. and H. Myers, Petitioners,

122 vs.

International Trust Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed, by this

Court that the decree of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States,

Appellant,

100 vs.

Burton Coal Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Plaintiff in error,

107 vs.

E. W. Porter and D. S. Weaver, Doing Business as Porter-Weaver Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

366 vs.

New York and Albany Lighterage Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was

argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank K. Bowers, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner, vs. Lloyd W. Seaman — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

367

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank K. Bowers, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner, vs. Thomas Staples Fuller. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

368

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,

Petitioner,

511 vs.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, with directions to dismiss the bill on the ground that the suit was brought by counsel without authority, but without prejudice to the bringing of any other suit hereafter by and with the authority of the alleged Pueblo of Santa Rosa.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,

61 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Davis Sewing Machine Company of Delaware,

Appellant,

82 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Sacramento Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Milton H. Salz, Doing Business as E. Salz & Son.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

R. S. Smyer and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company,
Appellants,
131 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed and this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
414 vs.
Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad
Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
5 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Butler.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
116 vs.
P. S. Royster Guano Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Special Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Mr. Justice Butler.

Louisiana and western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. John B. Gardiner. 120 — In error to the Court of Appeal of the State of Louisiana, First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal of the State of Louisiana, First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Louisiana and Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. John B. Gardiner. 120 — Order Allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeal of the State of Louisiana, First Circuit, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Louisiana and Western Railroad Company, Plaintiff in error,
120 vs.
John B. Gardiner.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeal of the State of Louisiana, First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal of the State of Louisiana, First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Wallace R. Farrington, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii;
William B. Lymer, Attorney General, etc., et al., Petitioners,
465 vs.
T. Tokushige et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
669 vs.
Leib Hitterman.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Vermont for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company of Hartford,
Petitioner,
45 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Texas; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charleston, South Carolina, Mining and Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
93 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Barrett Company,

Appellant,

105 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

De Forest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

142 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, United States Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

507 vs.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri restored; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion to substitute the Oklahoma Natural Gas Corporation as successor of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as the party plaintiff in error in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to a renewal of it on a fuller showing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Shawnee Gas and Electric Company, a Corporation, et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute the Oklahoma Natural Gas Corporation as successor of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, as the party plaintiff in error in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to a renewal of it on a fuller showing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

577 vs.

E. B. Spiller et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom et Cie, Societe Anonyme,

Petitioner,

354 vs.

Gulf Export and Transportation Company.

On consideration of the motion to require the petitioner to furnish security for the payment of the judgment below, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom et Cie, Societe Anonyme,

Petitioner,

354 vs.

Gulf Export and Transportation Company.

On consideration of the motion to furnish security for the payment of costs in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the amount of the cost bond is fixed at Two hundred and fifty dollars.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustavus A. Buder and Oscar E. Buder,

Petitioners,

846 vs.

Ehrhardt W. Franz.

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willie Conner and John Conner,

Plaintiffs in error,

176 vs.

H. U. Bartlett, H. G. Bailey, McMann Oil Company et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Nelson,

Plaintiff in error,

842 vs.

J. L. Walrod, S. E. Ellsworth, and C. W. Burnham.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And It is further ordered by this Court that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Nelson,

Plaintiff in error,

842 vs.

J. L. Walrod, S. E. Ellsworth, and C. W. Burnham.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Nelson,

Plaintiff in error,

842 vs.

J. L. Walrod, S. E. Ellsworth, and C. W. Burnham.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. M. Gorieb,

Petitioner,

799 vs.

Charles D. Fox, et al., Members of the City Council of Roanoke Virginia, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

801 vs.

W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading as Henry Marcus and Son.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

788 vs.

Marion Wiggins, Individually and as Executrix and Trustee under the will of W. B. Wiggins, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hagop Bogigian,

Petitioner,

789 vs.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Helen J. C. Bogigian,

Petitioner,

790 vs.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George N. Zonsoute,

Petitioner,

792 vs.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Washington ex rel. Isadore H. Edelstein,

Petitioner,

795 vs.

William A. Huneke, Judge of the Superior Court of Spokane County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Telfair Smith,

Petitioner,

796 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cats American Shipping Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
797 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Traction Ditcher Company, Petitioner,
798 vs.
The Austin Machinery Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Industrial Institute,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
Mrs. Burnham S. Marsh, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ida T. Dickinson, Luella J. Manning, Ellsworth Avery et al., Petitioner, vs. New England Power Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

803

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Barker Painting Company, Petitioner, vs. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

805

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dampskibs Aktieselsk Orient, claimant of the Danish Steamship "Natal", her engines, etc., Petitioner, vs. W. R. Grace and Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

806

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Gracie,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

810

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
William H. Muller and Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

821

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

Tomorrow, February 22nd, being a legal holiday there will be no session of the Court. The Court will adjourn at the conclusion of today's business until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Basin Oil and Gas Company,
Appellant,
vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior et al.

129

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, the mandate was granted in this cause.

Fritz Schutte,

Appellant,

164 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, Howard Sutherland, present Alien Property Custodian, was substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

Fritz Schutte,

Appellant,

164 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse in part and affirm in part the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stiulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, so far as it affirmed the dismissal of the bill of complaint, but reversed so far as it affirmed that portion of the decree directing the payment of thirty-five thousand dollars ($35,000.00); and that the case be remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with instructions to vacate so much of its decree as directed the payment of the aforesaid thirty-five thousand dollars ($35,000.00) as to which it shall be reversed; said decree in all other respects to remain in full force and effect; each party to pay their own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leopold Zimmermann et al.,

Appellants,

180 vs.

Frederick C. Hicks, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, Howard Sutherland, present Alien Property Custodian was substituted as a party appellee in this cause.

Calogero Maniglia, by his next friend and father, Antonino Maniglia,

Appellant,

235 vs.

The Commander of the S. S. Guiseppe Verdi and the Commissioner General of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. I. Biddle, as Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas,

771 vs.

Vuco Perovich.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, May 2nd next,.

Frank Weeke,

Plaintiff in error

812 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Walter A. Hill for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Pressed Steel Car Company,

Petitioner,

813 vs.

The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until Monday, February 28th next.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
869 vs.
Ole Burkeness.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner the time within which to serve the petition for certiorari, notice and record in this cause was extended until March 1st next, and the time within which the respondent may file a brief in opposition to the petition was extended until April 1st next.

Daniel O'Neill et al.,
Petitioners,
784 vs.
The United States of America.
Michael Whalen,
Petitioner,
785 vs.
The United States of America.
Nathan Goldstein,
Petitioner,
786 vs.
The United States of America.
Harry F. Stratton,
Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the respondent.

George H. Dale,
Plaintiff in error,
656 vs.
The State of Indiana.

The motion to reinstate this cause on the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses H. Clapp for the plaintiff in error.

Overland Motor Company
395 vs.
Packard Motor Car Company et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Donald M. Carter in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Winston, Strawn and Shaw and Donald M. Carter as amici curiae.

Mammoth Oil Company et al.,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Semaphoric Indicator Company et al,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Hummler for the petitioner.

The Davis Sewing Machine Company of Delaware,
Appellant,
82 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant, the mandate was granted in this cause.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, etc., as Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Herbert Noble in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs of Herbert Noble and Scott Scammell as counsel for the executors of the last will and testament of Charles G. Moebling, and brief of Sullivan and Donovan as counsel for Florence S. Schuette, executrix etc., as amici curiae.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, etc., as Executor etc.,
Petitioner,
795 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of George L. Shearer as counsel for Sarah Mae Plant et al., Executors, etc. as amici curiae.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, etc., as Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. O. Walker Taylor in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Frank W. Grinnell and O. Walker Taylor for the Old Colony Trust Company as amicus curiae.

Quaker City Cab Company,
Plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Robert Jones for the defendant in error.

Hanover Fire Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
179 vs.
George F. Harding, County Treasurer of the County of Cook, State of Illinois.

The motion for leave to file a brief in reply to the answer to the petition for rehearing in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright in behalf of counsel, and the motion was denied.

J. F. Lawrence et al.,
Appellants,
894 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Neale in behalf of Mr. Edwin Denby, Mr. Houston B. Teehee, Mr. T. L. Blakemore, and Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellant.

James M. Hodgson,
Appellant,
166 vs.
Federal Oil and Development Company et al.

The motion to amend the bill of complaint was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Hodgson for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Tyson S. Dynes, Mr. Peter H. Holmes, and Mr. Harold D. Roberts for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Red Star Motor Drivers' Association et al., Plaintiffs in error,
596 vs.
City of Detroit et al.

The motion to dismiss, affirm or advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Whitman, Mr. Charles P.O'Neill, and Mr. Clarence E. Page for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

I. J. Gordon et al., Plaintiffs in error,
674 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.
Charles Thomason et al., Plaintiffs in error,
675 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. George P. Barse in behalf of Mr. John B. Dudley for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file the statements of points to be relied upon in these cases

A. Stanley Copeland, Petitioner,
1081, of October Term, 1925
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Stanley Copeland pro se.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Malleable Iron Range Company, Petitioner.
No -- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund D. Quiggle in behalf of Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild and Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove for the petitioner.

Ellsworth Kelley, Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
State of Oregon.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long in behalf of Mr. I. H. Van Winkle for the defendant in error, leave was granted to file a designation of additional parts of the record to be printed, ~~on behalf of the defendant in error.~~

Ed Tumey,
Plaintiff in error,
527 vs.
The State of Ohio.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. T. Hardy Todd in behalf of Mr. Edward P. Mouliner for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file an additional brief for the plaintiff in error in this cause.

Paul L. James et al., partners, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
299 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Hamilton Chesten, Mr. Theodore W. Heath, Mr. Waller H. Staples, and Mr. Robert M. Hughes, Jr., for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Claudian B. Northrop, Mr. Gibbs L. Baker, and Mr. Thomas W. Shelton for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Petitioner,
345 vs.
State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Portland Cement Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
488 vs.
Michigan Public Utilities Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 606. United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton, and Youngstown Railway Company et al.

No. 638. Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 709. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

No. 710. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

No. 711. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

No. 712. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
713 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
714 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
715 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
716 vs.
Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

The motion to fix the time for oral argument of these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. August G. Gutheim, Mr. Frank Bergen, Mr. James W. Carmalt, and Mr. William H. Spear for the Public Service Electric and Gas Company; by Mr. Francis I. Gowen and Mr. F. M. Rivinus for the Akron, Canton & Younstown Railway et al.; by Mr. Francis B. Biddle, Mr. John Hampton Barnes, Mr. August G. Gutheim, Mr. Charles Heebner, Mr. Wayne Johnson, and Mr. Walker D. Hines for the Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.; by Mr. Frederick L. Ballard, Mr. Frederick H. Wood, Mr. Hoyt A. Moore, and Mr. Paul D. Cravath for the Bethlehem Steel Company; and by Mr. John Lord O'Brien, Mr. Hugh F. Smith, and Mr. Ralph J. Baker for the Rainey-Wood Coke

Harry H. Alston, 898 vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franz E. Lindquist for Harry H. Alston.
Harry H. Alston, 898 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franz E. Lindquist for Harry H. Alston.
Ex parte: In the Matter of Merle Phillips, Petitioner, -- Original.	The motion for leave to file a petitition for writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franz E. Lindquist for the petitioner.
Arkansas Railroad Commission et al., Appellants, 549 vs. Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Y. Beebe in behalf of Mr. Edward A. Haid and Mr. H. W. Applegate for the appellants.
State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 6, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States of America, Intervenor.	The fourth report of the Boundary Commission was submitted to the consideration of the Court and ordered filed on motion of Mr. Arthur A. Stiles and Mr. Arthur D. Kidder, the boundary commissioners appointed by the Court in this case.

City of Wichita Falls, Texas, Petitioner,
775 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
776 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, Mr. Arthur P. Drury, and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Luther J. Bailey and James E. Fulgham, Petitioners,
780 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore D. Peyser for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Howard W. Ameli for the respondent.

Malleable Iron Range Company, Petitioner,
783 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild and Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company(formerly Irving Bank-Columbia Trust Company), as Executor of the Estate of Herman Sielcken, deceased,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States.

Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard B. Smith and Mr. John L. McMaster for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
South Daviess County Drainage District.

N. S. Brown, Mr. Homer Hall, and Mr. S. J. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Platt Hubbell for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr.

William Stewart, enrolled as a Seminole Indian under the name of William, Med Lusty, acting for himself and as Guardian, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
808 vs.
C. B. Billington, Skelly Oil Company, C. M. Cade, et al, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Campbell, Mr. William W. Pryor, and Mr. William M. Stokes for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. P. Z. German and Mr. Alvin F. Moloney for the respondents.

E. B. Johnson, L. A. Sanders, County Treasurer of Grady County, Oklahoma, and Maxwell Investment Company,
Petitioners,
809 vs.
William Retzer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Dudley and Mr. Alger Melton for the petitioners, and by

Mr. A. D. Stevens and Mr. J. B. Furry for the respondent.

Frank Weeks,
Plaintiff in error,
812 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Norman J. Morrisson for the respondent.

American Surety Company and Albert Pick and Company,
Petitioners,
814 vs.
Steel's Consolidated, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Saperston for the petitioners, and by Mr. James C. Sweeney and Mr. Henry W. Killeen for the respondent.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
817 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward C. Craig, Mr. Charles A. Helsell, Mr. W. Horton, and Mr. C. J. Baird for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. William M. Offley for the respondent.

McGrew Coal Company,
Petitioner,
818 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Federal Agent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. James P. Green for the respondent.

The City of Seattle,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Puget Sound Power and Light Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy for the petitioner.

Puget Sound Power and Light Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
The City of Seattle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Howe for the petitioner.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
820 vs.
M. A. Inge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Greene and Mr. J. B. Ramsey for the respondent.

M. Coppard, Trustee of the Estate of Dollingers, Incorporated, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
822 vs.
B. C. Martin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Perry J. Lewis for the petitioner.

Toledo, St. Louis and Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
823 vs.
Hilbert Stuart Allen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Walter A. Eversman, Mr. Edward C. Crow, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioner.

A. C. Johns, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of M. Y. Foley, Inc., a Bankrupt, etc.,
824 vs. Petitioner,
United Bank and Trust Company of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, Mr. Edwin O. C. Dutton, and Mr. Theodore M. Stuart for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. S. Ewing, Mr. C. K. Cushing, Mr. Charles S. Cushing, Mr. Delger Trowbridge, and Mr. John E. Biby for the respondent.

A. C. Johns, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of M. Y. Foley, Inc., a Bankrupt, etc.,
Petitioner,
825 vs.
Pacific-Southwest Trust and Savings Bank et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Biby and Mr. George E. Farrand for the respondents.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company,
Petitioner,
830 vs.
Alva Crawford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Black and Mr. Edward G. Ince for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morse Ives for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
831 vs.
Agnes Sullivan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Errors for the Third Judicial District of the State of Connecticut was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Gibbons for the petitioner.

Saveria Spremulli,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John H. Parrott,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
John C. Noel, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. K. L. Campbell, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. William T. Sabine, Jr., for the respondent.

H. M. Davis, for the use and benefit of himself and all others similarly situated,
Petitioner,
834 vs.
M. J. McFarland et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. E. L. Saner, Mr. M. M. Crane, and Mr. Cullen F. Thomas for the respondents.

Alexander B. Stewart,
Petitioner,
835 vs.
The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Pendleton and Mr. Marion De Vries for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Arthur H. Lemborn, Gerard P. Tamelling, Charles C. Riggs, et al., Petitioners,
836 vs.
The National Bank of Commerce of Norfolk, Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis C. Van Doren, Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., Mr. H. G. Connor, Jr., and Mr. Edward S. Bentley for the petitioners.

Honto H. Tooley, individually and as executrix of estate of William L. Tooley, deceased, Petitioner,
837 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank G. Morris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry Preston Lawther for the respondent.

Charles Hoxie, Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Hellenthal and Mr. Morven Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Albert V. T. Day, Petitioner,
841 vs.
The Union Switch and Signal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Jones and Mr. William S. Pritchard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph L. Scott for the respondent.

William F. Allen and W. Herbert Hall, copartners, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. New York, Philadelphia and Norfolk Railroad Company, et al.

845

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Heath for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, Mr. George R. Allen, and Mr. Henry Wolfe Biklo for the respondents.

Gustavus A. Buder and Oscar E. Buder, Petitioners, vs. Ehrhardt W. Franz.

846

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar Buder and Mr. Gustavus A. Buder, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. Rayner Wallace and Mr. Allen McReynolds for the respondent.

White Oak Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

847

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Addison C. Burnham, Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. Robert S. Spilman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Howard W. Ameli for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen, Petitioner, vs. Hon. Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration.

848

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Alexander Milburn Company, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett, Mr. Edgar Allan Poe, and Mr. Guion Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Calvin Chesnut, Mr. Julius C. Harrison, Mr. Edwin G. Baetjer, and Mr. Fred H. Haggerson for the respondents.

W. C. Tucker, Petitioner,
850 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. H. Garnet for the for the petitioner and Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Fred W. Dewart for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Manly S. Sullivan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
853 vs.
Industrial Commission of Illinois et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Winnebago County, State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel H. Cady, Mr. Weldon A. Dayton, and Mr. H. M. Van Doren for the petitioner and by Mr. Roy F. Hall for the respondents.

James W. Bothwell, William J. Michel, et al., Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
854 vs.
Buckbee, Mears Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morton Barrows and Mr. George P. Metcalf for the petitioners.

Peter Lemieux, Petitioner,
855 vs.
The United States of America and Shah Bah Yaust.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Nat M. Lacy for the respondent.

Stanley C. Kimble and Walter E. Ahlberg, Administrators, etc., Petitioner,
856 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel H. Richards and Mr. Thomas E. French for the petitioners and by Mr. Paul Reilly for the respondent.

John M. Land, Petitioner,
857 vs.
Columbus Brockett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner.

Finance and Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
858 vs.
Henry W. Oppenhimer, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. M. Brandt for the petitioner.

Katherine Linstead, Executrix of the Estate of John A. Linstead, deceased, Petitioner,
860 vs.
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Katherine Linstead for the petitioner.

Birmingham Belt Railroad Company, Petitioner,
861 vs.
Jessie May Hendrix, as Administratrix of the Estate of George Hendrix, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. H. Cabaniss, Mr. Forney Johnston, and Mr. W. H. C. Cooke for the petitioner.

Peter Lemieux, Petitioner,
855 vs.
The United States of America and Shah Bah Yaust.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the petitioner.

J. J. Eiseman and Alexander H. Abrams, Plaintiffs in error,
722 vs.
The People of the State of California.
Holmes Ives and M. J. Whelan, Plaintiffs in error,
723 vs.
The People of the State of California.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed briefs and on motions to dismiss by Mr. H. P. Henshall for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

James Duigman, Appellant,
101 vs.
The United States of America and The Pall Mall Realty Corporation.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred J. Talley for the appellant, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Wednesday next at

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rommey, It is ordered that Edward J. Lee, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McDuffie, It is ordered that Vincent F. Kilborn, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick M. DeNeffe, It is ordered that John W. Biggs, Esquire, of Burns, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that William H. Donham, and Sidney L. Graham, Esquires, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Charles Melvin Neff, and John Wattawa, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Heisterman, It is ordered that Fred Schwertner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that William W. Potter, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. O'Neill, It is ordered that Andrew Penn Martin, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert L. Hall, It is ordered that Charles H. Allen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. V. Morgan, It is ordered that Elwood H. Seal, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Max Weksler,

Plaintiff in error,

165 vs.

Morgan G. Collins, Superintendent of Police of the City of Chicago et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and the plaintiff in error having

been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute the writ of error in this cause, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. F. H. Gibbs, of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Appellant,
100 vs.
Burton Coal Company.

On motion of Mr. Maclay Hoyne for the appellee, the mandate in this cause was granted.

The Liberty Warehouse Company,
Plaintiff in error,
159 vs.
Burley Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Marketing Association.

This cause was argued by Mr. Allan D. Cole for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Aaron Sapiro for the defendant in error.

Fairmont Creamery Company,
Plaintiff in error,
725 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leonard A. Flansburg for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles E. Phillips for the defendant in error.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
739 vs.
The State of Florida.

This cause was argued by Mr. Furman Y. Smith for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted by Mr. John B. Johnson for the defendant in error.

Jacob M. Dickinson, Receiver of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Appellant,
106 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira E. Robinson, it is ordered that Charles J. Schuck, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Virgil M. Chapman, it is ordered that Robert H. Hays, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas B. Shoemaker, it is ordered that Arthur E. Cook, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, it is ordered that Charles H. March, Esquire, of Litchfield, State of Minnesota, and John J. Courtney, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Ira A. Beck, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, and Arthur M. Kidder, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Burkart, It is ordered that David L. Elliott, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emory H. Niles, It is ordered that Joseph W. Starlings, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Walzer, It is ordered that Joseph W. Spencer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Bolitha J. Laws, It is ordered that Ralph S. Harris, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Central Securities Corporation, Appellant,
149 vs.
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the appellant, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. West for the appellees.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1927 - CONTINUED.

The United States,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
Stone and Downer Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William W. Hoppin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward P. Sharretts for the respondents.

The Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan,
Plaintiff in error,
151 vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. Charles B. Griffith, Attorney General.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John S. Dean for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Susan Lowe,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondent.

O. M. Rosengrant, doing business as the Riverside Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
162 vs.
Eva J. Havard.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. F. Kilborn for the defendant in error, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the plaintiff in error.

James M. Hodgson,
Appellant,
166 vs.
Federal Oil and Development Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James M. Hodgson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that C. C. Dill, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Lloyd David Both, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugo L. Black, It is ordered that Benjamin F. Ray, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that John P. Deering, Esquire, of Saco, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira E. Robinson, It is ordered that Louis A. Johnson, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., It is ordered that Joseph B. Fradenburg, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis Crane, It is ordered that Horace L. Lohnes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., It is ordered that Harry Silverman, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert H. Vestal, It is ordered that John Francis Hicak, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte:
In the matter of William Leather,
Petitioner.
No.--,Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. McCarron in behalf of Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the petitioner.

Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees,
Maryan H. Hauser, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
181 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property
Custodian of the United States,
Frank White, as Treasurer of the
United States and Deutsche Bank of
Berlin, Germany.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Deutsche Bank of Berlin,
Germany, Appellant,
182 vs.
Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees,
Maryan H. Hauser et al., etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
The State of Oklahoma et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, it is ordered that George Edgar Jackson, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Wassell, . It is ordered that A. F. House, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Henderson, it is ordered that Jacob Mark Lashly, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James M. Hodgson,
Appellant,
166 vs.
Federal Oil and Development Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James M. Hodgson for the appellant, and by Mr. Harold D. Roberts for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. James M. Hodgson for the appellant.

American National, as Receiver of the F. B. Collins Investment Company,
Appellant,
167 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles H. Garnett for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

The Timken Roller Bearing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
168 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
Thomas P. Goodbody, as Receiver of the Hydraulic Steel Company,
Plaintiff in error,
178 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Andrew P. Martin for the defendant in error, and the cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther Day, Mr. Rufus Day, and Mr. Donald W. Kling for the plaintiffs in error.

Louis Pizitz Dry Goods Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
171 vs.
Willis Yelldell, as Administrator, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph P. Mudd for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 28 next, at 12 o'clock.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benson Landon, It is ordered that David W. Kahane, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier, It is ordered that Edwin D. Crites, Esquire, of Chadron, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordginly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walker D. Hines, It is ordered that John A. McQuillan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, It is ordered that Joseph C. White, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Hampton Barnes, It is ordered that Francis B. Biddle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan D. Perlman, It is ordered that Jacob H. Gilbert, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bird J. Vincent, It is ordered that Kim Sigler, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, it is ordered that Etta Louise Taggart and Fred Lee Woodson, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Irene Rutherford O'Crowley, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that H. W. Applegate, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Frank M. Kemp, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel G. Bratton, It is ordered that Julien C. Seth, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Cecil H. MacMahon, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company and Pan American Petroleum Company,

Petitioners,

305 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Tyson and Brother--United Theatre Ticket Offices, Inc.,

Appellant,

261 vs.

Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney of the County of New York, State of New York, and Vincent B. Murphy, as Comptroller of the State of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Brandeis
Mr. Justice Stone

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Ex parte:
In the matter of William Leather
Petitioner.
---,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per. Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Semaphoric Indicator Company et al.,
Petitioner.
---,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per. Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Malleable Iron Range Company,
Petitioner.
---,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to a resumption of the application in some other form.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Merle Phillips,
Petitioner.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mammoth Oil Company et al.,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas Railroad Company et al.,
Appellants,
549 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Quaker City Cab Company,
Plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 18th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. F. Lawrence et al., etc., et al.,
Appellants,
894 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday April 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Lemieux,

Petitioner,

855 vs.

The United States of America and Shah Bah Yaust.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custoday as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Lemieux,

Petitioner,

855 vs.

The United States of America and Shah Bah Yaust.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George K. Dale,

Plaintiff in error,

656 vs.

The State of Indiana.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause on the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul L. James and W. Willis Houston, Partners, Trading as Pan-Handle Coal Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

299 vs.

Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

In error to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the writ of error heretofore filed in this cause, and treating the same as a petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.-

Paul L. James and W. Willis Houston, Partners, Trading as Pan-Handle Coal Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Norfolk and Western Railway Company. In error to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

299

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Star Motor Drivers Association et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The City of Detroit et al.

596

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Star Motor Drivers Association et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. City of Detroit, et al.

596

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3rd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Wecke, Plaintiff in error, vs. The United States of America.

812

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the writ of error heretofore filed in this cause, and treating the same as a petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Frank Weeke,

Plaintiff in error,

812 vs.

The United States of America.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Stanley Copeland,

Petitioner,

October Term, 1925
1081 / vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6 Original. vs.

The State of Texas,

Defendant,

United States of America,

Intervener.

On consideration of the request to receive and file the Fourth Report of the Boundary Commissioners in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said report be, and the same is hereby, received and ordered filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. J. Riseman and Alexander R. Abrams,

Plaintiffs in error,

722 vs.

The People of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, and on motion to dismiss, or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Holmes Ives and H. J. Whelan,

Plaintiffs in error,

723 vs.

The People of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, and on motion to dismiss, or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr.,

Plaintiff in error,

739 vs.

The State of Florida.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob M. Dickinson, receiver of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,

Appellant,

106 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Securities Corporation,

Appellant,

149 vs.

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company and The New York Central Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings. ~~In conformity with the opinion of this Court.~~

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan,

Plaintiff in error,

151 vs.

The State of Kansas ex rel. Charles B. Griffith, Attorney General.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. M. Rosengrant, doing business as the Riverside Manufacturing Company,

Plaintiff in error,

162 vs.

Eva J. Havard.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Timken Roller Bearing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
168 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas P. Goodbody, as Receiver of the Hydraulic Steel Company,
Plaintiff in error,
178 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Malleable Iron Range Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
823 vs.
Hilbert Stuart Allen.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur H. Lamborn, Gerard P. Tameling, Charles C. Riggs, et al., Petitioners,
836 vs.
The National Bank of Commerce of Norfolk, Virginia.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel O'Neill, Harry Levin and Morris Multin, Petitioners,
784 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Whalen,

Petitioner,

785 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathan Goldstein,

Petitioner,

786 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Stratton,

Petitioner,

787 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Wichita Falls, Texas, Petitioner,
775 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
776 vs.
The United States.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luther J. Bailey and James E. Fulgham, Petitioners,
780 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company (formerly Irving Bank-Columbia Trust Company, as Executor of the estate of Herman Sielcken, deceased, Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company,

Petitioner,

804 vs.

South Daviess County Drainage District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. B. Jonnson, L. A. Sanders, County Treasurer of Grady County, Oklahoma, and Maxwell Investment Company,

Petitioners,

809 vs.

William Fetzer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Weeks,
Plaintiff in error,
812 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company and Albert Pick & Company,
Petitioners,
814 vs.
Steel's Consolidated, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
817 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McGrew Coal Company,
Petitioner,
818 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Federal Agent.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Seattle,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Puget Sound Power and Light Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
The City of Seattle.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. M. A. Inge. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

820

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Coppard, Trustee of the Estate of Dollingers, Incorporated, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. B. C. Martin. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

822

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. C. Johns, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of E. Y. Foley, Inc., a Bankrupt, etc., Petitioner, vs. United Bank and Trust Company of California. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

824

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. C. Johns, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of M. Y. Foley, Inc., a Bankrupt, etc.,

Petitioner,

825 vs.

Pacific-Southwest Trust & Savings Bank, J. M. Lynes, individually etc., Andrews Bros., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway Company,

Petitioner,

830 vs.

Alva Crawford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

831 vs.

Agnes Sullivan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Errors, Third Judicial District, of the State of Connecticut.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Errors, Third Judicial District, of the State of Connecticut, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Saveria Spremulli,

Petitioner,

832 vs.

Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Parrott,

Petitioner,

833 vs.

John C. Noel, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. K. Davis, for the use and benefit of himself and all others similarly situated,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

S. J. Mosarland, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander S. Stewart,

Petitioner,

835 vs.

The District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, Southern Division et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monto M. Tooley, individually and as executrix of estate of William L. Tooley, deceased,

Petitioner,

837 vs.

Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pressed Steel Car Company,

Petitioner,

813 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pressed Steel Car Company,

Petitioner,

813 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the respondent, and he having moved the Court to affirm in part, and modify in part, the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in accordance with a stipulation of counsel filed in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in so far as it determined that the petitioner is not entitled to recover any sum in this action or and from the United States, be affirmed, and that the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of the United States upon its counter-claim be modified by reducing the amount thereof to the sum of $126,202.15, plus the sum of $1,775.34, the costs allowed by that Court, and that the cause be forthwith remanded to the Court of Claims to proceed accordingly.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift and Company et al. and Armour and Company et al.,

909 vs.

The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company,

Plaintiff in error,

504 vs.

The Railroad Commission of Texas.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Fred H. Wood in that behalf, leave was granted to substitute Claude Pollard, present Attorney General of the State of Texas, in place of Dan Moody, formerly Attorney General of the State of Texas, as a party defendant in error.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant,
The United States of America,
Intervenor.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. T. Hardy Todd in behalf of counsel for the defendant, State of Texas, leave was granted to withdraw certain specified original exhibits in this case.

Hope Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
815 vs.
Grant T. Hall, State Tax Commissioner of West Virginia et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. Townsend and Mr. Fred O. Blue for the defendants in error.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Ira Jewell Williams, John H. Stone, and W. R. Foraker as amici curiae.in this cause.

Ellsworth Kelley,
Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
The State of Oregon.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. Will H. King for the plaintiff in error, the time within which the brief for the plaintiff in error may be filed was

extended until March 21st next.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
839 vs.
Merchants Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll Single, Mr. S. Hasket Derby, and Mr. Benjamin S. Grosscup for the petitioner.

Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

852 vs.

D. W. Michaux, Chester H. Bryan, A. J. Dow, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. White and Mr. Samuel A. T. Watkins for the petitioners.

Thomas H. Tarn,

Petitioner,

859 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Newport", her engines, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

863 vs.

Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the petitioners.

Detroit Terminal Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

865 vs.

Pennsylvania-Detroit Railroad Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Robson for the petitioner.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving partner, etc., Petitioner,

531 vs.

The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Ira Jewell Williams, John H. Stone, and F. R. Forakar as amici curiae.

F. S. Aendrick and J. A. Aendrick, Petitioners,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick, Mr.
867 vs.	
Mary W. Aendrick.	

S. M. Leftwich, and Mr. Paul Carrington for the petitioners, and by Mr. David B. Trammett for the respondent.

Caroline H. McDowell, Executrix of the Estate of Jesse C. McDowell Deceased, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
868 vs.	was submitted to the consideration of
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, 23d District, Pennsylvania.	the Court by Mr. William C. Heiner for the petitioner.

Ormsby McKnight Mitchel, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
871 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman Aaron for the petitioner.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
872 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Helm Bruce and Mr.

Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner

Standard Oil Company, Incorporated in Kentucky, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
873 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Middleton, Mr. Edward P. Humphrey, and Mr. William W. Crawford for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
877 vs.
Harriet Hubbard Ayer, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Bayard F. Meiner, and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner.

E. B. Morris, doing business as Morris and Lowther et al.,
Appellants,
372 vs.
William Duby et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. J. M. Devers for the appellees.

Louis Pizitz Dry Goods Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
171 vs.
Willis Weldell, as Administrator, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin F. May for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph T. Mudd for the plaintiff in error.

George F. Fowling and Company,
Appellant,
172 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:.

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucius P. Robinson, it is ordered that Farwell Knapp, Esquire, of West Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James E. Watson, it is ordered that Arthur H. Robinson, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, it is ordered that Arthur Carnduff, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. Mell Brooks et al.,
Plaintiffs in error.
499 vs.
D. H. Blackwood, Treasurer.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Applegate for the defendant in error.

George F. Fawling and Company,
Appellant,
172 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the appellant.

Carl Franz Adolf Otto Ingenohl,
Petitioner,
174 vs.
Walter E. Olsen and Company, Inc.

This cause was argued by Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., for the respondent.

Leopold Zimmermann et al.,
Appellants,
180 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellants; by Mr. Samuel R. Wachtell for the appellee, the Weiner Bank Verein, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Barnum, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the appellee, Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

Munich Reinsurance Company,
Appellant,
183 vs.
First Reinsurance of Hartford,
Connecticut.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Cummeen for the appellant, and by Mr. Lucius P. Robinson, and Mr. Charles Wells Gross for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that David Wallace Stewart, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that William Harrison Freedman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Enoch, It is ordered that Samuel Mayo Hinsker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. McIlvaine, it is ordered that J. Francis Dammann, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Beall Kent, It is ordered that Dudley Cooke Smith and Henry W. Block, Jr., Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clark Burdick, it is ordered that Walter Adler, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 606. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton, and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 638. Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton, and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 709. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

No. 710. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

No. 711. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

No. 712. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

No.713. Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al.,
Appellants,
714 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al.,
Appellants,
715 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al.,
Appellants,
716 vs.
Public Service Electric Gas Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, appellant in Nos. 606, 709, 710, 711, and 712; continued by Mr. Francis I. Cowen and by Mr. F. M. Rivinus for the Akron Canton & Youngstown Railway et al., appellees in Nos. 606 and 638; by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the Bethlehem Steel Company et al., appellees in No. 710; by Mr. Walker D. Hines for the Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al., appellees in No. 709.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Barker, it is ordered that Milton Andrew Romjue, Esquire, of Macon, State of Missouri; Marcy K. Brown, Jr., and George H. Combs, Jr., Esquires, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, it is ordered that Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, it is ordered that Thos. H. Keaton, Esquire, of Trenton, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Daniel, it is ordered that Cordie Page, Esquire, of Conway, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Delacy, it is ordered that Clarence A. Dawson, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry C. Webb, it is ordered that John A. Webb, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 606. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton, and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 638. Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants, vs. The Akron, Canton, and Youngstown Railway et al.

No. 709. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

No. 710. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

No. 711. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

No. 712. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, vs. Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

No. 713. Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants, Berwind-White Coal Mining Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
714 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company et al.

Pocahontas Operators' Association, et al., Appellants,
715 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for Bethlehem Steel Company et al., appellees in No. 710; and concluded by Mr. H. Granville Curry for the Interstate Commerce Commission, appellant in Nos. 606, 709, 710, 711, and 712; and cases submitted to the Considera-

Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., Appellants,
716 vs.
Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

tion of the Court by Mr. Ralph J. Baker and Mr. John Lord O'Brian for the Rainey-Wood Coke Company et al., appellees in Nos. 711 and 715; by Mr. Frank Bergen, Mr. Wm. A. Speer, and Mr. August Gutheim for the Public Service Electric and Gas Company, appellee in Nos. 712 and 716; by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Company, appellee in Nos. 709 and 713; and by Mr. A. A. Greever for the Pocahontas Operators' Association et al., appellants in Nos. 638, 713, 714, 715, and 716.

Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company, Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Charles H. Phelps, etc., et al., Petitioners,
631 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. S. Demming for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

United States of America ex rel. Norwegian Nitrogen Products Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
The United States Tariff Commission et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition to appear as amicus curiae, for the sole purpose of moving to dismiss, was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. Walter Wade Hampton in behalf of J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Company, and the motion was denied.

United States of America ex rel. Norwegian Nitrogen Products Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
The United States Tariff Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George H. Davis for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered Francis P. Burns and Walter Winn Wright, Esquires, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Daniel, It is ordered that Proctor A. Benham, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Edward A. McLaughlin, Jr., and John E. Hannigan, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, it is ordered that Coulter D. Young, Esquire, of New Rochelle, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Will Morris,
Plaintiff in error,
794 vs.
State of Louisiana.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. A. Owsley Stanley in behalf of Mr. George Wesley Smith for the plaintiff in error, this cause was reassigned for argument during the month of April, the date to be decided upon by counsel.

William A. Rhea,
Petitioner,
199 vs.
Thomas C. Smith.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hackney for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. R. Robertson for the respondent.

The United States of America, ex rel. Norwegian Nitrogen Products Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
The United States Tariff Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Marion DeVries for the plaintiffs in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
190 vs.
The United States of America, the Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. S. Enoch for the appellants, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for appellee, the United States of America, and by Mr. D. W. Knowlton for appellee, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. C. Fulbright for appellee, Houston Cotton Exchange & Board of Trade and Dallas Cotton Exchange.

Margay Oil Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
191 vs.
H. W. Applegate, as Attorney General of Arkansas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. F. Rouse for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Applegate and Mr. Sam M. Wassell for the defendants in error.

City of Kansas City, Missouri,
Plaintiff in error,
192 vs.
Robert S. Baker.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John T. Barker for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Elizabeth S. Shubert et al., executrices, etc.,
Petitioners,
193 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. D. McIlvaine for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Wright, it is ordered that John D. Nix, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Louise Trimble Foster, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Frank L. A. Graham, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors at this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Myers, it is ordered that John H. Carson, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, and George Mowry, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, it is ordered that J. Wilson Parker, Esquire, of Fairburn, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that Dean S. Pace, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that E. Crippen, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce L. Castoel, it is ordered that Charles B. Lingamfelter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel F. Frank, it is ordered that Harry J. Leffert, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

L. A. Nixon, Plaintiff in error, vs. O. C. Herndon and Charles Porras. In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

117

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ad Tumey,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

527 vs. State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Harry M. Alston

898 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in this cause in forma pauperis, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that this case having been brought into this Court on the certificate of the Judges of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit that the whole record herein be sent up to this Court and directs the Clerk that the printing herein shall not be done until the complete record is received.

And it is further ordered that the application of Alston, the plaintiff in error in the Circuit Court of Appeals, asking that the case be advanced, be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for hearing on Monday, April 11th, 1927, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hope Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
81b vs.
Grant F. Hall, State Tax Commissioner of West Virginia, and Howard B. Lee, Attorney General of West Virginia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Mell Brooks and Blytheville Special School District No. 5.
Plaintiffs in error,
499 vs.
D. H. Blackwood, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift and Company et al., and Armour and Company et al.,
909 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Rawling and Company,
Appellant,
172 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Munich Reinsurance Company,
Appellant,
185 vs.
First Reinsurance Company of Hartford.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margay Oil Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
191 vs.
H. W. Applegate, as Attorney General of Arkansas; Sam S. Sloan, Treasurer etc., and John Carroll Cone, Auditor etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Kansas City, Missouri,
Plaintiff in error,
192 vs.
Robert S. Baker.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen, Petitioner, vs. Hon. Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration.

848

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. C. Tucker, Petitioner, vs. Adel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

850

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Manly S. Sullivan.

851

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James W. Bothwell, William J. Michel et al., Receivers of Employers Mutual Insurance and Service Company, Petitioners, vs. Buckbee, Mears Company.

854

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Finance and Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
868 vs.
Henry W. Oppenheimer, Trustee in
Bankruptcy for W. A. Lee, trading as
National Motor Company, Bankrupt.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Stewart, enrolled as a Seminole Indian under the name of William, Ned Lusty, acting for himself and as Guardian, etc., et al.
Petitioners,
808 vs.
C. S. Billington, Skelly Oil Company,
W. M. Wade, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Noxie,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert v. A. Day,
Petitioner,
841 vs.
The Union Switch and Signal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William F. Allen and W. Herbert Hall, co-partners, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
845 vs.
New York, Philadelphia and Norfolk Railroad Company, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustavus A. Buder and Oscar E. Buder,
Petitioners,
846 vs.
Ehrhardt W. Franz.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per. Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

White Oak Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. — 847

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Alexander Milburn Company, Petitioner, vs. Union Carbide & Carbon Corporation, Union Carbide Company, Union Carbide Sales Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. — 849

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Industrial Commission of Illinois, et al., and Louis Veruchi, Administrator of the estate of Dominic Veruchi, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Winnebago County, State of Illinois. — 853

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Winnebago County, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stanley C. Kimble and Walter A. Ahlberg, Administrators of Bernard A. Ahlberg, deceased.

Petitioners,

856 vs.

Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Land,

Petitioner,

857 vs.

Columbus Brockett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fong Suey Chong,

Appellant,

315 vs.

John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

The motion to dismiss this cause and that mandate issue forthwith was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee in support of the motion.

Yip Wah, alias Jim, alias Woo Yip Woo,

Appellant,

525 vs.

John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

The motion to dismiss this cause and that the mandate issue forthwith was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee in support of the motion.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

816 vs.

The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, the submission of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was postponed until Monday, March 21 next, with leave to the respondent to file a brief on or before Friday, March 18 next, per stipulation of counsel.

Benjamin or Ben Harmon,

Plaintiff in error,

353 vs.

Joseph W. Tyler.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Walter Winn Wright in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Bertrand A. Cahn, City Attorney of the City of New Orleans, as amicus curiae in this cause.

Black and White Taxicab and Transfer Company,

Petitioner,

866 vs.

Brown and Yellow Taxicab and Transfer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Stout for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
870 vs.
Sakharam Ganesh Pandit.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner.

The First National Bank of Ogden, Utah,
Petitioner,
875 vs.
The First National Bank of Rigby, Idaho.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. DeVine and Mr. J. A. Howell for the petitioner.

The Sylvester Company,
Petitioner,
878 vs.
Malcolm H. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Fuller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. John H. Wheeler for the respondent.

A. Henry Wemme Company,
Petitioner,
879 vs.
Ben Selling, Dr. Allen P. Noyes, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Hickey and Mr. Thomas Mannix for the petitioner.

500 Cases of Tomatoes and Italia- American Shipping Corporation, Petitioners, 883 vs. Francis H. Leggett & Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondent.
Cropper Knitting Mills, Inc., Petitioner, 885 vs. Franklin Knitting Mills, Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Avel B. Silverman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M. Evarts for the respondent.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company(now Reading Company) Petitioner, 886 vs. William A. Auchenbach.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Schneider for the respondent.
Gulf,Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner, 891 vs. L. C. Touchstone.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the petitioner.
Mrs. J. W. Peebles and J. W. Peebles, Petitioners, 892 vs. The Exchange Building Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Canada for the petitioners.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and Gauley Company,

Petitioners,

895 vs.

Cary C. Hines, Administrator de bonis non of the personal estate of William Crennell, Jr., deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Braxton County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. E. Haymond for the petitioners.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and Gauley Company,

Petitioners,

896 vs.

Cary C. Hines, Administrator de bonis non of the personal estate of William Crennell, Jr., deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. E. Haymond for the petitioners.

William E. Guy,

Petitioner,

897 vs.

Honorable Jake Fisher, Judge of the Circuit Court of Braxton County, Cary C. Hines, Administrator de bonis non, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. E. Haymond for the petitioner.

The Derby Oil Company,

Petitioner,

900 vs.

H. H. Motter, Internal Revenue Collector for the District of Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Brennan and Mr. Harry H. Smith for the petitioner.

Ellamar Mining Company,
Petitioner,
216 vs.
The Alaska Steamship Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation by counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Higgins and Edward S. Higgins, Copartners doing business under the firm name of William A. Higgins and Company,
Petitioners,
889 vs.
California Prune and Apricot Growers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth F. Shukert et al., Executrices, etc.,
Petitioners,
193 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Nebraska.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William B. McIlvaine and Mr. Arthur F. Mullen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas H. Lewis for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioners to file an additional brief.

Robert Gallagher et al.,
Appellants,
195 vs.
John E. Hannigan, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Old Colony Foreign Exchange Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward A. McLaughlin, Jr. for the appellee, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry and Mr. Robert Gallagher for the appellants.

Robert Gallagher et al.,
Appellants,
195 vs.
John E. Hannigan, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Old Colony Foreign Exchange Company.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward A. McLaughlin, Jr., and Mr. John E. Hannigan for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry and Mr. Robert Gallagher for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Hector N. Zahn and A. W. Ross,
Plaintiffs in error,
196 vs.
Board of Public Works of the City of Los Angeles, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. J. Hill for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Lucius P. Green for the defendants in error.

Ed C. Curdts et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
197 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. P. A. Bonham for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, It is ordered that Sidney Post Simpson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold D. Medina, It is ordered that Pike Powers Waldrop, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, It is ordered that Richard Elliott Marine, Esquire, of Pittsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Purnell M. Milner, It is ordered that Claude L. Johnson, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James Willos,
Plaintiff in error,
864 vs.
State of Oregon.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles L. McNary in behalf of Mr. Thomas Mannix for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed.

Florence L. Clay, Nora Webb, Wm. Chandler, et al.,
Appellants,
201 vs.
The City of Eustis.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. John E. Laskey, in behalf of counsel for the appellants in this cause, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ed. C. Curdts et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
197 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. P. A. Bonham for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. Cordie Page for the defendant in error.

Joseph Seeman et al.,
Petitioners,
198 vs.
Philadelphia Warehouse Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel F. Frank for the petitioners and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent.

Benjamin or Ben Harmon,
Plaintiff in error,
353 vs.
Joseph W. Tyler.

This cause was argued by Mr. Loys Charbonnet for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Francis P. Burns and Mr. Walter Winn Wright for the defendant in error.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
James M. Lee, alias James M. Leach.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the petitioner. No brief filed for the respondent.

C. O. Westfall,
766 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. S. Face for Westfall.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. P. Gore, It is ordered that Howard L. Weaver, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lyman R. Critchfield, It is ordered that Alton H. Etling, Esquire, of Orrville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that Daniel B. Welty, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 203. State of Missouri ex rel. Washington University, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 204. State of Missouri ex rel. Washington University, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 205. State of Missouri ex rel. St. Louis Brewing Association, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 206. State of Missouri ex rel. St. Louis Brewing Association, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 207. State of Missouri ex rel. Wainright Real Estate Company, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 208. State of Missouri ex rel. Wainright Real Estate Company, plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

State of Missouri ex rel. Hotel Statler Company, Inc.,

Plaintiff in error,

209 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

These cases were continued per stipulation of counsel.

C. O. Westfall,

766 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. D. S. Face for Westfall and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

Frank W. Keeler,
Plaintiff in error,
811 vs.
Stanley Myers, as District Attorney; etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Ellsworth Kelley,
Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
The State of Oregon.

This cause was argued by Mr. John H. Carson for the defendant in error, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will R. King for the plaintiff in error on brief to be filed on or before March 21st next pursuant to the order of this Court of February 28th last.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
200 vs.
Sisal Sales Corporation, Charles D. Orth, Alvin W. Krech, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellant, and by Mr. W. W. Aldrich for the appellees, Sisal Sales Corporation et al., and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the appellees, Hanson and Orth et al.

Robert L. Messel,
Petitioner,
202 vs.
Foundation Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Claude L. Johnson for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Purnell M. Milner for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin N. Cherrington, It is ordered that Andrew J. Onderdonk, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that Roy L. Deal, Esquire, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Hill, It is ordered that Nelson Emmons, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

H. C. Haas,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
L. Greenwald et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

George Lee Miller and Frances Miller,
Plaintiffs in error,
219 vs.
Board of Public Works of the City of Los Angeles, Charles H. Treat and Hugh McGuire, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and the plaintiffs in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute this writ of error, and failing to appear,

It is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. S. Gibson, Sheriff of Lyon County, Kansas, Plaintiff in error,
221 vs.
National Bond and Investment Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Smith and Mr. Roland Boyton for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

Demetrios Anastopoulos,
Appellant,
223 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The Ohio Public Service Company,
Plaintiff in error,
210 vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph O. Fritz, Prosecuting Attorney.
The Ohio Public Service Company,
Plaintiff in error,
264 vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph O. Fritz, Prosecuting Attorney.

These cases were argued by Mr. Carl H. Henkil and Mr. Frank M. Cobb for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Lyman R. Critchfield and Mr. Alton H. Elting for the defendant in error.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
211 vs.
Alfred Klessner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop".

This cause was argued by Mr. A. F. Busick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry S. Barger for the respondent.

Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
214 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. D. C. Smith for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the defendant in error.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
Eastman Kodak Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is [illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Lynch, It is ordered that George W. C. McCarter, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sharron, It is ordered that John S. Montgomery, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Scott, It is ordered that Charles C. Collins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Dock Company,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Steamship "Poznan", her engines, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the respondent, this cause was reassigned for argument at the foot of the call for Monday next.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
Eastman Kodak Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner.

Foster Kelton et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
220 vs.
Wallace Kelton.

This cause was argued by Mr. Haskell B. Talley for the plaintiffs in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error. Leave was granted to Mr. Haskell B. Talley to file an additional brief for the plaintiffs in error within ten days from this date.

Dimmitt Hoffman, Judge of the Thirtieth Judicial Circuit of Missouri,
Plaintiff in error,
225 vs.
State of Missouri ex rel. W. E. Foraker, administrator, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Roy W. Rucker for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Thomas E. Williams, as State Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al.,
Appellants,
226 vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. O. S. Stillman and Mr. Hugh La Master for the appellants, and by Mr. Wymer Dressler for the appellee.

Burnrite Coal Briquette Company,
Petitioner,

227 vs.

Edward G. Riggs et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James J. Lynch for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Merritt Lane for the respondent. Leave was granted to petitioner to file an additional brief on or before Tuesday next.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Patrick B. O'Sullivan, Esquire, of Orange, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Elliott, It is ordered that William C. Mentzer, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Irvin Stewart, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, It is ordered that John E. Hubbell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Kenyon, It is ordered that Theodore S. Kenyon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Carl Franz Adolf Otto Ingenohl, Petitioner, vs. Walter E. Olsen and Company, Inc. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

174

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

In re: Disbarment of Sidney A. Schwartz. — On consideration of the motion to vacate the order of disbarment of January 10, 1927, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fortune Ferguson, Jr., Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Florida. — On consideration of the motion to amend the order granting leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, so as to include the expense of printing brief for the plaintiff in error,

739

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied for lack of statutory authority.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fong Suey Chong,

Appellant,

315 vs.

John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yip Wah, alias Jim, alias Woo Yip Woo,

Appellant,

525 vs.

John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Gallagher, Joseph A. Dennison, and Daniel V. McIsaac,

Appellants,

195 vs.

John E. Hannigan, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Old Colony Foreign Exchange Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and

decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin, or Ben Harmon,

Plaintiff in error,

353 vs.

Joseph W. Tyler.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank W. Keeler,

Plaintiff in error,

811 vs.

Stanley Myers, as District Attorney etc., and Thomas M. Hurlburt, Sheriff of Multnomah County, Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank W. Keeler,

Plaintiff in error,

811 vs.

Stanley Myers, as District Attorney etc., and Thomas M. Hurlburt, Sheriff of Multnomah County, Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the writ of error heretofore filed in this cause

and treating the same as a petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. S. Gibson, Sheriff of Lyon County, Kansas,
Plaintiff in error,
221 vs.
National Bond and Investment Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ed C. Curdts, Vardry McBee, Robert Wilson, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
197 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Katherine Linstead, Executrix of the Estate of John A. Linstead,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as

Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine etc., et al., Petitioners,

852 vs.

D. W. Michaux, Chester H. Bryan, A. J. Dow et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Newport," her engines etc., et al., Petitioners,

863 vs.

Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Black and White Taxicab and Transfer Company, Petitioner,

866 vs.

Brown and Yellow Taxicab and Transfer Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Birmingham Belt Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
861 vs.
Jessie May Hendrix, as Administratrix of the Estate of George Hendrix, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
839 vs.
Merchants Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas H. Tarn,
Petitioner,
859 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Detroit Terminal Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
865 vs.
Pennsylvania-Detroit Railroad Company and Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. S. Kendrick and J. A. Kendrick,
Petitioners,
867 vs.
Mary W. Kendrick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Caroline H. McDowell, Executrix of the Estate of Jesse C. McDowell, deceased,
Petitioner,
868 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, 23rd District, Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ormsby McKnight Mitchel,

Petitioner,

871 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

877 vs.

Harriet Hubbard Ayer, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

870 vs.

Sakharam Ganesh Pandit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The First National Bank of Ogden, Utah, Petitioner,
875 vs.
The First National Bank of Rigby, Idaho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 21st until Monday, April 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toxaway Mills, Petitioner,
259 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having confessed error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the Court of Claims in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed;

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
262 vs.
Ed McMahan Harrison, Midwest Oil Company, and The Southwestern Oil Company.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, counsel for the United States of America in this cause, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the certificate in this cause in accordance with a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties, filed in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
Appellant,
267 vs.
Freights, Sub-Freights, Charter Hire and/or Sub-Charter Hire of the S. S. "Mount Shasta".

This cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant,
The United States of America,
Intervener.

The statement of work done, the time employed and the expenses incurred by the commissioners in the survey and mapping of the Texas and Oklahoma boundary along the Red River from the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, to the eastern boundary of the State of Oklahoma, as described in the fourth report of the commissioners, dated January 31st, 1927, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur D. Middor and Mr. Arthur A. Stiles, the boundary commissioners appointed by the Court herein.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt Paving and Rubber Company.

The motion for leave to file a brief on behalf of the Patent Bar of the City of Chicago as amicus curiae in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church, and the motion was denied.

John W. Blodgett,
779 vs.
Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Pace in behalf of Mr. Mark Norris for Blodgett.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Louisiana Western Railroad Company,
—, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and motion that the Court issue a temporary stay forthwith, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Michael M. Irwin, and Mr. Francis Williams for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company, Petitioner.
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and motion that the Court issue a temporary stay forthwith, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Michael M. Irwin, and Mr. Francis Williams for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Franklin and Abbeville Railway Company,
——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and motion that the Court issue a temporary stay forthwith, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Michael M. Irwin, and Mr. Francis Williams for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Lake Charles and Northern Railroad Company.
——,Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and motion that the Court issue a temporary stay forthwith was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Michael M. Irwin, and Mr. Francis Williams for the petitioner.

Clement H. Betts,
Petitioner,
826 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lucius H. Beers, Mr. Franklin B. Lord, and Mr. Parker McCollester for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Sophie Weichers,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
Birdie Weichers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick C. Peterson and Mr. Albert E. Carter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herman Phleger for the respondent.

Marion B. Friedenwald,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
Herbert Friedenwald.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty and Mr. Edwin A. Meeers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the respondent.

Red Wing Malting Company,
Petitioner,
893 vs.
Levi M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Oppenheimer and Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Wilebrandt, and Mr. J. L. Monarch for the respondent.

Alice A. Bauchspies,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ulysses S. Koons for the petitioner.

Earl Carroll,
Petitioner,
901 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Herbert C. Smith, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, and Mr. H. H. Yeatman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Land Company of Florida,
Petitioner,
907 vs.
I. H. Petty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Cann and Mr. Samuel B. Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. B. Lovett and Mr. Robert M. Hitch for the respondent.

National Electric Ticket Register Company, Petitioner,
908 vs.
Automatic Ticket Register Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis E. Giles for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. W. Marshall for the respondent.

Julia Barnet Rice, Petitioner,
910 vs.
Mark Eisner, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Fred W. Dewart for the respondent.

Henry C. Dunlap, Petitioner,
911 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam G. Bratton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. G. A. Iverson for the respondent.

George McNeir, Petitioner,
966 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell L. Bradford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Charles E. Ruthenberg,
Plaintiff in error,
44 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a suggestion of the death of Charles E. Ruthenberg, the plaintiff in error in this cause has been presented, and a motion of counsel for the said plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause having been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos Arocho,
Petitioner,
961 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Antonsanti for the petitioner.

Burnrite Coal Briquette Company,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
Edward G. Riggs et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Merritt Lane for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George W. C. McCarter for the petitioner.

Victor Talking Machine Company,
Petitioner,
222 vs.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes and Mr. William H. Kenyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota, O.P.B. Jacobson, et al., and City of Duluth,
Appellants,
228 vs.
The Duluth Street Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. C. Carman for the appellants,

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Charles S. Hayden, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Faust, It is ordered that William L. Vandeventer, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer D. Angell, It is ordered that A. L. Miller, Esquire, of Vancouver, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred M. Dudley, It is ordered that Thomas Balmer, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Kerkam, It is ordered that Dwight B. Cheever, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Regis Noel, It is ordered that Stanley Konopka and Paul B. Sloan, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorney and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

E. J. Kelly,
Plaintiff in error,
244 vs.
F. E. Watkins and Paul S. Cotner.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. B. Moore, Mr. A. T. West, and Mr. W. Y. Dilley for the defendants in error. The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Moore, Mr. A. T. West, and Mr. W. Y. Dilley for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota et al.,
Appellants,
228 vs.
The Duluth Street Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. B. Richards for the appellant, the City of Duluth, and concluded by Mr. Oscar Mitchell for the appellee.

New York Dock Co.,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Steamship "Poznan", her engines, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. J. Feild for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the respondents.

Charles B. Beery,
Plaintiff in error,
232 vs.
James G. Houghton, as Inspector of Buildings for the City of Minneapolis.

This cause was argued by Mr. Niel M. Cronin for the defendant in error, and the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Burke Elliott and Mr. C. S. Lobingier for the plaintiff in error.

American Railway Express Co. et al.,
Petitioners,
233 vs.
Jacob Kriger.

This cause was argued by Mr. Clinton H. McKay for the petitioners. No brief was filed for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Appellant,
234 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy H. Moore, It is ordered that Clarence B. Zewadski, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis E. Spiegler, It is ordered that Albert W. Willard, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Casper S. Yost, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. A. Frost, etc.,
Appellant,
373 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the appellant.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

The motion to substitute W. T. Phillips, Jr., H. J. Crawford, J. V. Ritts, Leonard C. Ritts, R. W. Hannan, A. W. Leonard, and R. C. Sharp as members of and constituting the board of directors of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as parties plaintiffs in error in lieu of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a dissolved corporation, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn in that behalf.

Power Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
258 vs.
Harvey Saunders.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Pugh and Mr. Thomas S. Buxbee for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William R. Denham for the defendant in error.

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Appellant,
234 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellee.

Luther Weedin, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.,
Petitioner,
237 vs.
Chin Bow.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondent. Leave was granted to Mr. Alfred A. Wheat to file an additional memorandum for the petitioner within one week.

L. Kadow et al.,
Plaintiff in error,
241 vs.
William Paul et al., Commissioners.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. D. Angell for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. A. L. Miller for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred M. Dudley, It is ordered that F. T. Merritt, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Coffin, It is ordered that Isaac McDougall, Esquire, of Pocatello, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert H. Putney, It is ordered that Marshall Solberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, It is ordered that C. Alexander Capron, Esquire, of Upper Montclair, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert Howson, It is ordered that Hubert Abbe Howson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of the United States, etc.,
Petitioner,
394 vs.
Electric Reduction Company.
Malleable Iron Range Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance these cases for argument immediately after case No. 291, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley in behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner in No. 394, and for the respondent in No. 783.

Miller Lumber Company, Archer Lumber Company, Theo Fathauer Lumber Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
260 vs.
W. E. Floyd, Ed Harper, and Clay Henderson, as Commissioners composing the Arkansas Railroad Commission.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Coleman for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. H. W. Applegate, Mr. John L. Carter, and Mr. Brooks Hays for the defendants in error.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Wheeling Can Company.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Fort Smith Light and Traction Company,
Plaintiff in error,
269 vs.
Board of Improvement of Paving District No. 16, of the city of Fort Smith, Arkansas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, Mr. Henry L. Fitzhugh, and Mr. R. M. Campbell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John P. Woods for the defendant in error.

Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
242 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of the State of Idaho.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. M. Dudley and Mr. Thomas Balmer for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. E. Elmquist for the respondent.

Allan Pinkerton, doing business as Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, et al.,
Appellants,
246 vs.
Eugene Wengert, John W. Woller et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. H. Wood for the appellants, and by Mr. Eugene Wengert for the appellees.

Beech-Nut Packing Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Charles Sager Collier, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Michael M. Irwin, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Irving M. Baxter, Esquire, of Utica, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman B. Landreau, It is ordered that Edgar J. Treacy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jennie M. Blair, nee Adair,
Plaintiff in error,
270 vs.
Sam F. Wilkerson, Maud Schneider, Individually and as Executrix, etc., et al.

This cause was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Beech-Nut Packing Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
P. Lorillard Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Portneuf Marsh Valley Canal Company,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Howard W. Brown et al., Trustees.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. C. Coffin for the peitioner, and by Mr. Edwin Snow for the respondents.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
256 vs.
George L. Wimberley, Jr., Administrator.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and the cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph B. Ramsey for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carter B. Keene, It is ordered that Rolland Lee Nutt, Esquire, of Kankakee, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Sternhagen, It is ordered that Cedric A. Major, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Annabel Matthews, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Thomas L. Mitchell, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that John M. Dunham, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter, It is ordered that Simon T. Patterson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Irving H. Cox, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

First National Bank of Hartford,
Wisconsin, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
186 vs. State of Wisconsin.
City of Hartford, and State of Wis-
consin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The State of Minnesota, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme
Petitioner, Court of the State of Minnesota.
245 vs.
First National Bank of St. Paul.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Georgetown National Bank,
Plaintiff in error,
78 vs.
Ollie McFarland, Sheriff of Scott County, Kentucky; The Fiscal Court of Scott County, Kentucky etc., et al.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Elizabeth F. Shukert and Isabel C. Shukert, Executrices of the Estate of Gustave E. Shukert, Deceased, Petitioners,
193 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Nebraska.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Louisiana Western Railroad Company. Petitioner.
——,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for a temporary stay in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad Steamship Company. Petitioner,
——,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for a temporary stay in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Franklin and Abbeville Railway Company.
Petitioner,
——,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for a temporary stay in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Lake Charles and Northern Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
——,Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for a temporary stay in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion to substitute W. T. Phillips, Jr., H. J. Crawford, J. V. Ritts, Leonard C. Ritts, R. W. Hannan, A. W. Leonard, and R. C. Sharp, as members of and constituting the Board of Directors of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company as the party plaintiff in error in this cause in lieu of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a dissolved corporation,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos Arocho,
Petitioner,
961 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos Arocho,
Petitioner,
961 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of the United States, etc., Petitioner,

394 vs.

Electric Reduction Company.

Malleable Iron Range Company, Petitioner,

783 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases to be heard immediately following case No. 291, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the name of Mitchell Gin Company, Appellant,

375 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday: April 25, 1927.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Blodgett,

779 vs.

Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assinged for argument on Monday, October 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas E. Williams, As State Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska; J. A. Cates, as County Clerk, Adams County, Nebraska; Pearl B. Woodworth, etc., et al. Appellants,

226 vs.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Talking Machine Company, Petitioner,
222 vs.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company and John Bailey Browning.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. J. Kelly, Plaintiff in error,
244 vs.
F. E. Watkins and Paul S. Cotner.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles B. Beery,

Plaintiff in error,

232 vs.

James G. Houghton, as Inspector of Buildings for the City of Minneapolis.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company and Clinton H. McKay,

Petitioners,

233 vs.

Jacob Kriger.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Seaboard Air Line Railway,

Appellant,

234 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miller Lumber Company, Archer Lumber Company, Theo Pathauer Lumber Company et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. W. E. Floyd, Ed Harper, and Clay Henderson, as Commissioners Composing the Arkansas Railroad Commission.

260 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. George L. Wimberley, Jr., Administrator.

256 On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson Burr, A. S. Wells et al., etc.

653 On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the order of November 23, 1926, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case, be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
654 vs.
The State of Florida ex rel. R. Hudson burr, A. S. Wells et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the order of November 23, 1926, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case, be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
872 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company, Incorporated in Kentucky, Petitioner,
873 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
891 vs.
L. G. Touchstone.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George McNeir, Petitioner,
966 vs.
Charles V. Anderson, as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sylvester Company, Petitioner,
878 vs.
Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Henry Wemme Company, Petitioner, vs. Ben Selling, Dr. Allen P. Noyes, Edgar H. Sensenich, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

879

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

500 Cases of Tomatoes and Italia-American Shipping Corporation, Petitioners, vs. Francis H. Leggett and Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

883

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cropper Knitting Mills, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Franklin Knitting Mills, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

885

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company (now Reading Company), Petitioner, vs. William A. Auchenbach. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

886

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. J. W. Peebles and J. W. Peebles, Petitioners, vs. The Exchange Building Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

892

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company and Gauley Company, Petitioners, vs. Cary C. Hines, Administrator de bonis non of the personal estate of William Crennell, Jr., deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Braxton County, State of West Virginia.

895

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Braxton County, State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
896 vs.
Cary C. Hines, administrator de bonis non of the personal estate of William Crennell, Jr., deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William E. Guy, Petitioner,
897 vs.
Honorable Jake Fisher, Judge of the Circuit Court of Braxton County, Cary C. Hines, administrator de bonis non, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Derby Oil Company, Petitioner,
900 vs.
H. H. Motter, Internal Revenue Collector for the District of Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Clement H. Betts, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 826

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sophie Weichers, Petitioner, vs. Birdie Weichers. 887

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marion B. Friedenwald, Petitioner, vs. Herbert Friedenwald. 888

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Wing Malting Company,
Petitioner,
893 vs.
Levi M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alice A. Bauchspies,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Earl Carroll,
Petitioner,
901 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Land Company of Florida, Petitioner, vs. I. H. Petty. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

907

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Electric Ticket Register Company, Petitioner, vs. Automatic Ticket Register Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

908

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julia Barnet Rice, Petitioner, vs. Mark Eisner, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

910

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry C. Dunlap,
Petitioner,
911 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

No. 656. George R. Dale, plaintiff in error, vs The State of Indiana.

No. 844. The United States of America, plaintiff in error, vs John R. Hanby and F. J. Sullivan.

No. 851. The United States of America, petitioner, vs Manly S. Sullivan.

No. 864. James Willos, plaintiff in error, vs. State of Oregon;

No. 880. Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife, plaintiffs in error, vs. Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners..

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
881 vs.
State of Louisiana.
Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
882 vs.
State of Louisiana.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases upon the docket be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 25th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

The United States of America,
262 vs.
Ed McMahon Harrison et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States, the mandate was granted in this cause.

Miller and Lux, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
756 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record, and the motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adolphus E. Graupner for the plaintiff in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Carl I. Wheat for the defendants in error, in opposition thereto.

The Timken Roller Bearing Company,
Plaintiff in error,
168 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.
Thomas P. Goodbody, as Receiver of the Hydraulic Steel Company,
Plaintiff in error,
178 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The motion to transfer these cases to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. William L. Day for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Andrew Squire, Mr. Thomas M. Kirby, and Mr. Andrew P. Martin for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Malleable Iron Range Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild and Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove for the petitioner, in support of the motion.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme,
Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Allen in behalf of Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, Mr. Hugo Mock, and Mr. Asher Blum for the petitioner.

Gilliland Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
583 vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Belzer, in behalf of Mr. G. W. Hendricks, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. W. Applegate for the defendant in error.

Grainger Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
934 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.
H. J. Hughes Company,
Petitioner,
935 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.
Bliss Syrup Refining Company,
Petitioner,
936 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Challen B. Ellis in behalf of Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., and Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a reply brief for the petitioners in these cases.

The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spencer Gordon and Mr. Dean G. Acheson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. John E. Hoover for the respondent.

Samuel J. Kornhauser,
Petitioner,
829 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Thomas P. Duffy,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Patterson for the respondent.

Fred Hood,
Petitioner,
913 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren K. Snyder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Corona Cord Tire Company,
Petitioner,
915 vs.
Dovan Chemical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds, Mr. Frank E. Barrows, and Mr. William H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. James J. Kennedy for the respondent.

El Reno Wholesale Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
California Prune and Apricot Growers, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Aaron Sapiro for the respondent.

Alice McClelland,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Highway Construction Company and
George Stewart.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Alice McClelland pro se.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
919 vs.
J. A. Myers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elmer C. Sharp for the respondent.

Hermann F. M. Mutzenbecher, Franz F. Mutzenbecher, Ernest Behre, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
920 vs.
Sumner Ballard.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jennings C. Wise and Mr. Frank D. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. David Rumsey for the respondent.

Ivor Armstrong,
Petitioner,
921 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest B. D. Spagnoli for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

The Liberty National Bank of South Carolina, at Columbia, et al., etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
922 vs.
J. W. McIntosh, as Comptroller of the Currency of the United States et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. B. Herbert and Mr. John K. Shields for

Charles J. Barnes and Jean Mason Barnes, Margaret Mulvihill, and Frank Mulvihill, Petitioners,
923 vs.
Southern Pacific Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gurney E. Newlin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Thunen, Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, and Mr. W. I. Gilbert for the respondents.

Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme, Petitioner,
925 vs.
John W. Arnold, Dan H. Arnold, Adelaide F. Arnold, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Allen, Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, Mr. Hugo Mock, and Mr. Asher Blum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lorenzo D. Armstrong for the respondents.

Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme, Petitioner,
926 vs.
John W. Arnold, Dan H. Arnold, Adelaide F. Arnold, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lorenzo D. Armstrong for the respondents.

Union Trust Company of Maryland, Petitioner,
928 vs.
Chapman A. Peck, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Buck for the petitioner, and by Mr. G. Ridgely Sappington and Mr. Charles G. Baldwin for the respondent.

Louise Taylor,
Petitioner,
932 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. DeLacy and Mr. William Clark DeLacy for the petitioner.

Robert Murphy and Edward Caples et al., as Trustees and Executors of Mrs. M. A. Caples, deceased,
Petitioners,
933 vs.
Frank W. Wellacott, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Estate of Joseph Caples, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Walker Morrow for the petitioners, and by Mr. William H. Burges for the respondent.

Grainger Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
934 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., and Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Fradenburg for the respondent.

H. J. Hughes Company,
Petitioner,
935 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., and Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Fradenburg for the respondent.

Bliss Syrup Refining Company,
Petitioner,
936 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., and Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Fradenburg

E. B. Cantrell et al.,
Petitioners,
937 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rhodes Semmes Baker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Roscoe Hunnicutt,
Petitioner,
938 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rhodes Semmes Baker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Stamatix Anastasopoulos et al.,
Petitioners,
940 vs.
Steger and Sons Piano Manufacturing Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. O'Donnell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward J. Brundage, Mr. Benson Landon, Mr. Robert N. Holt, and Mr. David W. Kahane for the respondents.

Daniel J. Shields,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Lowry Humes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Samuel Oppenheim,

Petitioner,

949 vs.

William C. Hecht, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Russell and Mr. M. Wallace Dixon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert D. Murray for the respondent.

Ida Conley,

Plaintiff in error,

942 vs.

N. J. Wollard, Administrator of the Estate of Ethan L. Zane, deceased.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Ida Conley pro se.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 11th, at

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, It is ordered that Robert T. Swaine, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., It is ordered that William B. Bush, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Lacy, It is ordered that Ralph W. Garrett, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Harris, It is ordered that Thomas A. J. Dockweiler, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, It is ordered that Francis P. Matthews, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, and Thomas P. White, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Nieser, It is ordered that Hugh A. Minahan and John W. Reynolds, Esquires, of Green Bay, State of Wisconsin, and Adolph Kanneberg, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Thomas Hunt and John W. Lowrance, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. Dempsey, It is ordered that Michael J. Dunn, Jr., Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, It is ordered that Robert T. McCracken, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Stem, It is ordered that M. Edward Rose, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Samuel W. McNabb, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Carl A. Feick, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel.
Norwegian Nitrogen Products Co., et al. Plaintiff in error, vs.
91 The United States Tariff Commission, Thomas O. Marvin, William S. Culbertson, et al.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said Court of Appeals and of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same are hereby, vacated;

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to dismiss the petition as moot.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Louis Pizitz Dry Goods Company, Incorporated, Plaintiff in error, vs.
171 Willis Yeldell, as Administrator of the Estate of Carrie Yeldell, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

New York Dock Company, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Poznan," Her Engines, etc., and John B. Harris Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

229

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York reinstated and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Fidelity National Bank and Trust Company of Kansas City, Standard Investment Company, Silas De Lap, et al., Appellants, vs. Felix H. Swope and Gertrude M. Brown.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

46

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

James McDonald, Jr., and James McDonald, III, and Alexander McDonald, Infants, by their Guardian ad litem, Charles V. Imlay, Petitioners,

147 vs.

Lawrence Maxwell and Fulton Trust Company, Executors.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs nunc pro tunc as of January 20, 1927, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

American National Company as Receiver for the F. B. Collins Investment Company, Appellant,

167 vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Donald Page et al., Administrators of the Estate of Michael B. Ryan, deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

136

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, By, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

33

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, By, etc. — In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

33

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the

same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James C. Davis, Director General, Plaintiff in error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, By, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

34

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

James C. Davis, Director General, Plaintiff in error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, By, etc. — In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

34

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Susan Lowe,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
Alexander J. Dickson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Appellants,
190 vs.
United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Houston Cotton Exchange et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Bedford Cut Stone Company, The Central Oolitic Stone Company, The Chicago and Bloomington Stone Company et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America, Michael W. Mitchell, Individually, etc., et al

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Concurring in the result:
Mr. Justice Sanford.
Mr. Justice Stone.

Cimmitt Hoffman, Judge of the Thirtieth Judicial Circuit of Missouri, Plaintiff in error, vs. State of Missouri ex rel. W. E. Foraker, Administrator of the Estate of James Starling Foraker, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

225

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Fairmont Creamery Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

725

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Stone.

The Ohio Public Service Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph O. Fritz, Prosecuting Attorney of Wayne County, Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

210

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Ohio Public Service Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. Joseph O. Fritz, Prosecuting Attorney of Wayne County, Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

264

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James M. Hodgson,
Appellant,
166 vs.
Federal Oil and Development Company and The Mountain and Gulf Oil Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming..

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota, O. P. B. Jacobson et al., and The City of Duluth,
Appellants,
228 vs.
The Duluth Street Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Beech-Nut Packing Company, Petitioner, vs. P. Lorillard Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

249

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Shelby Iron Company of New Jersey and Shelby Iron Company of Alabama. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

123

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel J. Shields,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

See order granting certiorari in 944 at page 625.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ellsworth Kelley,
Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
State of Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ellsworth Kelley,
Plaintiff in error,
827 vs.
State of Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the writ of error heretofore filed in this cause, and treating the same as a petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Ford, George Harris, J. Evelyn, et al.,
Petitioners,
312 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme,
Petitioner.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Contreras,
Petitioner,
15, Original. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus to compel the allowance of a writ of error from the District Court of Alaska, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied for the reason that the motion contains no averment of fact or law that would justify the issuance of such a writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Contreras,
Petitioner,
15, Original. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in an order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miller and Lux, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in error,
756 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, H. W. Brundige, C. L. Seavey et al., etc.

On consideration of the suggestion of diminution of the record and the motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Malleable Iron Range Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause for additional findings.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is remanded for additional findings by the said Court of Claims from the evidence already introduced before the Court of Claims in respect to the outlay in bonds or money required to be deposited by the petitioner herein in securing a stay of the execution of the judgment against the petitioner in the suit against it by the United States in the United States District Court for the eastern District of Wisconsin and in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ida Conley,
Plaintiff in error,
942 vs.
N. J. Wollard, Administrator of the Estate of Ethan L. Zane, deceased.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied,

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in an order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ida Conley,
Plaintiff in error,
942 vs.
N. J. Wollard, Administrator of the Estate of Ethan L. Zane, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ida Conley,
Plaintiff in error,
942 vs.
N. J. Wollard, Administrator of the Estate of Ethan L. Zane, deceased.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the writ of error heretofore filed in this cause and treating the same as a petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gilliland Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
363 vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
983 vs.
D. J. Alford.
David Atkins,
Plaintiff in error,
992 vs.
The State of Ohio.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases on the docket be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 25 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel J. Kornhauser,
Petitioner,
839 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Cord Tire Company,
Petitioner,
915 vs.
Dovan Chemical Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel J. Shields,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
The United States of America.

See order in No. 944 at page 620.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas P. Duffy,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Hood,
Petitioner,
913 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordred by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

El Reno Wholesale Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
California Prune and Apricot Growers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alice McClelland,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Highway Construction Company and George Stewart.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. J. A. Myers. 919

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hermann F. M. Mutzenbecher, Franz F. Mutzenbecher, Petitioners, vs. Sumner Ballard. 920

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivor Armstrong, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 921

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles J. Barnes and Jean Mason Barnes, Margaret Mulvihill and Frank Mulvihill,
Petitioners,
923 vs.
Southern Pacific Company and Southern Pacific Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme,
Petitioner,
925 vs.
John W. Arnold, Dan H. Arnold, Adelaide F. Arnold, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maison Dorin Societe Anonyme,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
John W. Arnold, Dan H. Arnold, Adelaide F. Arnold, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Trust Company of Maryland,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Chapman A. Peck, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louise Taylor,
Petitioner,
932 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Murphy and Edward Caples et al., as Trustees and Executors of Mrs. M. A. Caples, deceased,
Petitioners,
933 vs.
Frank W. Wellacott, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Estate of Joseph Caples, bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grainger Brothers Company, Petitioner,
934 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. J. Hughes Company, Petitioner,
935 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bliss Syrup Refining Company, Petitioner,
936 vs.
G. Amsinck and Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. B. Cantrell et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

937

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roscoe Hunnicutt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

938

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stamatis Anastasopoulos, et al., Petitioners, vs. Steger and Sons Piano Manufacturing Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

940

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Samuel Oppenheim, Petitioner, 949 vs. William C. Hecht, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, 577 vs. E. B. Spiller et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. North T. Gentry in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Missouri as amicus curiae in this cause.

The St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, 577 vs. E. B. Spiller et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Clifford B. Allen in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief on behalf of Missouri shippers as amicus curiae in this cause.

The State of New York, Complainant, 14, Original. vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion to require the defendants to answer the bill of complaint herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., for the complainant, and suggestions of the defendants in response to the motion were submitted by Mr. James M. Beck for the defendants, with leave to Mr. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., to file a reply to the defendants suggestions on or before Monday next.

Alexander Latzko et al.,
Petitioners,
337 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy,
338 vs.
Alexander Latzko et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spencer Gordon in behalf of counsel.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of The Barber Asphalt Company, Petitioner.
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Charles Heave, Mr. Samuel E. Hibben, Mr. Henry M. Paul, and Mr. Edward L. Patterson for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of The Lakewood Engineering Company et al.,
Petitioners,
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Dennett for the petitioners.

Rafael Baragano,
Plaintiff in error,
1038 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

In error to the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

Mr. William Cattron Rigby, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"I, Joaquin Lopez, Secretary-Reporter of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, do hereby certify:-

That in the case of The People of Porto Rico, defendant in error, v. Rafael Baragano, plaintiff in error, No. 2296, a Writ of Error from the Supreme Court of the United States was allowed on March 7, 1925; and that the Transcript of the Record in said case was sent to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C., on March 4, 1926.

And at the request of Hon. Jose E. Figueras, Prosecuting Attorney

of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, I issue this certificate, in the City of San Juan, Porto Rico, this 20th day of December, 1926.

(Signed) Joaquin Lopez

Joaquin Lopez,

Secretary-Reporter of the

Supreme Court of Porto Rico."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,
324 vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to supplement the record as originally printed in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Janes in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error.

Will Morris, Plaintiff in error,
794 vs.
State of Louisiana.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Henry C. Lank in that behalf, this case was assigned for argument on Monday, April 25 next, por stipulation of counsel.

C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
394 vs.
The Electric Reduction Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Donald Horne as amicus curiae in this cause.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
869 vs.
Ole Berkeness.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the petitioner.

David A. Wright,
Petitioner,
914 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ashby Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Percy M. Cox for the respondent.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
916 vs.
C. H. Priester.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark and Mr. Ray Rushton for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. N. Powell for the respondent.

George Orlov,
Petitioner,
924 vs.
Harry Sawyer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Orlov and Mr. Walter B. Houghton for the petitioner.

The Rex Amusement Company,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
Marianita Truschel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph S. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benj. L. Rosenbloom for the respondent.

Fred M. Kirby,
Petitioner,
929 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Cornell and Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
930 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin L. McKinley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Bowman-Hicks Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
931 vs.
Glenn W. Robinson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Cochran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the respondent.

Drew Haven Dunn,
Petitioner,
939 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Wehrle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William L. Barnard,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Ellis Lady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant

Gustave Henry and William Henry,
Petitioners,
945 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh L. Dickson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Fort Smith, Subiaco and Rock Island Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
946 vs.
Emma Moore, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner, and by Emma Moore pro se.

Grace Liska Pons et al.,
Petitioners,
947 vs.
State Bank and Trust Company, Guardian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman Farrell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles H. Rutherford, Mr. K. T. McConnico, Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, and Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes for the respondents.

Southern California Edison Company,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, Mr. George E. Trowbridge, Mr. William M. Conley, and Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Duncan for the respondents.

Sigmund Stern, Petitioner, 950 vs. Empire Gas and Fuel Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Boys, Mr. Arthur Mag, and Mr. Roy B. Thomson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leslie J. Lyons and Mr. Warren T. Spies for the respondent.
Western Willite Company, Petitioner, 952 vs. Trinidad Asphalt Manufacturing Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston, Mr. J. Granville Meyers, and Mr. Delos C. Hayes for the petitioner.
Andrew W. Mellon, agent, under Section 206 of the Transportation Act of 1920 (New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad), Petitioner, 953 vs. New Jersey Shipbuilding and Dredging Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Evan Shelby and Mr. John E. Walker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Ash for the respondent.
May Berg and Frederick C. Raichley, Petitioners, 954 vs. Harry J. Merchant and Clyde C. Smith, as Executors, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Fraser and Mr. I. J. Ringolsky for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hector S. Young for the respondents.

Adelaide McColgan, as Administratrix with the will annexed, of the estate of Daniel A. McColgan, deceased,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
Charles H. Clark and Edward Bergner, as Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold C. Faulkner for the petitioner.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
958 vs.
C. H. Priester.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis R. Stark and Mr. Ray Rushton for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. H. Powell for the respondent.

Ethel M. Howe, Administratrix of the estate of Fred C. Howe, deceased,
Petitioner,
959 vs.
Michigan Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Bresnahan and Mr. Elmer H. Groefsema for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Walter Dohany and Mr. Frank E. Robson for the respondent.

Vernon S. Story,
Petitioner,
960 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. O'Shea for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal,
Petitioner,
963 vs.
John Busch.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Branch P. Kerfoot, Mr. Charles W. Stockton, and Mr. Henry B. Closson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph C. Barclay for the respondent.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut,
Petitioner,
964 vs.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Fairfield County, State of Connecticut, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Farwell Knapp, and Mr. Lucius F. Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Abraham L. Gutman and Mr. Kenneth Dayton for the respondents.

Charles Watson,
Petitioner,
967 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. Coffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt and Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Henry N. Paul, Mr. Samuel E. Hibben, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander F. Reichmann, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, and Mr. William P. Hall for the respondent.

National Spiritualists Association, Petitioner,
970 vs.
Sarah A. Vestal, Robert Ingersoll Jackson, Wm. A. Jackson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will C. Austin for the petitioner.

Maggie Kemmerer, as Administratrix etc., Petitioner,
971 vs.
Reading Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondent.

Magnetic Manufacturing Company and John P. Bethke, Petitioners,
972 vs.
Dings Magnetic Separator Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Robb, Mr. Bert M. Kent, and Mr. Harry C. Robb for the petitioners, and by Mr. George L. Wilkinson and Mr. Louis Quarles for the respondent.

Redondo Steamship Company, Inc., Petitioners,
973 vs.
The Archibald McNeil and Sons Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Spencer Gordon for the respondent.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, Petitioners,
974 vs.
North Side Canal Company, Limited, and The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mentzer and Mr. Wilford W. Neilson for the petitioners.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll,
Petitioners,
975 vs.
Twin Falls Canal Company and The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mentzer for the petitioners.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll,
Petitioners,
976 vs.
North Side Canal Company, Limited and The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mentzer and Mr. Wilford W. Neilson for the petitioners.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll,
Petitioners,
977 vs.
Twin Falls Canal Company and The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mentzer for the petitioners.

Continental Securities Company,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
The Michigan Central Railroad Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. C. Angell and Mr. Frank E. Robson for the respondents.

Alamo Foods Company, Petitioner,
979 vs.
Alexander S. Walker, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. G. Newton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the respondent.

Agustin Segurola and Manuel Santiago, Petitioners,
980 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. B. Wilcox for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Shur-On Optical Company, Inc. and Shur-On Standard Optical Company, Inc., Petitioners,
984 vs.
American Optical Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. C. Schuyler David for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Harrison F. Lyman for the respondents.

Kirstein Optical Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
985 vs.
American Optical Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Harrison F. Lyman for the respondents.

Walter S. Hooper,
Petitioner,
991 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

The Red Ball Transit Company,
Appellant,
277 vs.
Charles C. Marshall, et al., Constituting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of Mr. W. D. Hiner, as President of the Red Ball Transit Company, the appellant in this cause, to dismiss this appeal, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. L. Sparkman, J. W. Cates, L. O. Howell, et al.
Plaintiffs in error.
676 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty National Bank of South Carolina, at Columbia, J. W. McCormick, H. W. Woddward, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
922 vs.
J. W. McIntosh, as Comptroller of the Currency of the United States and Malcolm S. McConihe, as Receiver, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause, at the cost of the petitioners, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merle Phillips, Petitioner,
1011 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

Humboldt Land and Cattle Company, Appellant,
671 vs.
Robert A. Allen, as State Engineer of the State of Nevada, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry A. Guiler for the appellant, and by Mr. G. B. Thatcher for the appellees.

Fox River Paper Company, Patten Paper Company, Limited, Appleton Woolen Mills, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
492 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Moses Hooper for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that William S. Pritchard, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Edward W. Shepard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Eugene C. Taylor and Frank W. Dahn, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Saunders, It is ordered that David A. Murphy, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell, It is ordered that J. Stanley Payne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Edwin H. Pennock, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that S. Fred Wetzler, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph J. Kelley, It is ordered that James Vincent Barnitt, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, and Joseph J. Weinberger, Esquire, of Passaic, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Fox River Paper Company, Patten Paper Company, Limited, Appleton Woolen Mills, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
492 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. H. M. Rieser in that behalf, leave was granted to file an additional brief for the defendant in error. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Moses Hooper for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. W. J. Dempsey for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. H. M. Rieser for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Adolph Kanneberg for the defendant in error.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
577 vs.
E. B. Spiller et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Saunders and Mr. D. A. Murphy for the respondents.

Mammoth Oil Company et al.,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John W. Lacey in that behalf, four hours was allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John W. Lacey for the petitioners.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward H. Chandler, It is ordered that Stephen Chandler, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. Dahn, It is ordered that Charles L. Yancey, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Meeks, It is ordered that Howard F. Bresee, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Charles B. McClintock, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mammoth Oil Company, Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Company and Sinclair Pipe Line Company,

Petitioners,

719 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John W. Lacey for the petitioners, continued by Mr. Edward H. Chandler for the petitioner, the Sinclair Pipe Line Company, by Mr. Owen J. Roberts and Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Don F. Reed, It is ordered that Henry O. Harriman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. B. Ogilby, It is ordered that Jerome F. Barnard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, It is ordered that Henry R. Baird, Esquire, of Port Huron, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Yancey, It is ordered that Dale C. Dillon, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 974. State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, petitioners, vs. North Side Canal Company, Limited, and the United States of America.

No. 975. State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, petitioners, vs. Twin Falls Canal Company and The United States of America.

No. 976. State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, petitioners, vs. North Side Canal Company, Limited, and The United States of America.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, Petitioners, 977 vs. Twin Falls Canal Company and The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent hereafter.

Harry R. Alston, 898 vs. The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hooper Alexander and Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for Alston, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

Demetrios Anastopoulos, Appellant, 223 vs. John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and the Appellant having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute the appeal in this cause, and failing to appear,

It is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
267 vs.
Freights, Sub-Freights, Charter Hire, and/or Sub-charter Hire of the S.S. "Mount Shasta".

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the appellant, and by Mr. Thomas Hunt and Mr. John H. Lowrance for the appellee.

The United States ex rel. Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Titus for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peyton Gordon, It is ordered that George D. Horning, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that Lucien Henry Mercier, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, it is ordered that Bartholomew W. Butler and Albert E. Reitzel, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Theordore G. Risley, Esquire, of Mount Carmel, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Parmenter, It is ordered that William B. Johnson, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. G. Gardiner, It is ordered that Clarence A. Fry, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, It is ordered that Robert Cawling, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Road Improvement District No. 1, of Franklin County, Arkansas, et al., Appellants, vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company. 38

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by including a provision that it is without prejudice to a lawful revision of the assessment conformably to the state statute and not exceeding $15,000 in amount, and as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

R. B. Morris, doing business as Morris & Lowther; H. M. Hewitt and Lew Nunamaker, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Wm. Duby, H. B. Duzer, and W. H. Malone, etc. 372

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
211 vs.
Alred Klesner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop", Hooper & Klesner.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Federal Trade Commission and Victor Murdock, Huston Thompson, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
1 vs.
Claire Furnance Company, The Klla Furnace Company, Reliance Coke Company, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be,

and the same is hereby, remanded to ~~the said Court of Appeals with directions to remand the case to~~ the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with direction to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

L. Kadow, R. J. Firestone, A. R. Canfield, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error, In error to the Supreme Court

241 vs. of the State of Washington.

William Paul, Walter Marohbank, and George Ungemach, as Commissioners, etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Timken Roller Bearing Company, In error to the District Court

Plaintiff in error, of the United States for the

168 vs. Northern District of Ohio.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to set aside the dismissal of this cause and to substitute therefor an order transferring it to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that the order of this Court entered on February 28th, 1927, dismissing this cause for want of jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas P. Goodboy, as Receiver of the Hydraulic Steel Company,
Plaintiff in error,
178 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to set aside the dismissal of this cause and to substitute therefor an order transferring it to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that the order of this Court entered on February 28th, 1927, dismissing this cause for want of jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
337 vs.
Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Petitioner,
338 vs.
Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Barber Asphalt Company, Petitioner.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Lakewood Engineering Company, Petitioner.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the right to file a petition for a writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,
324 vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to supplement the record herein as originally printed, It is now here ordered that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with the requirement that a sufficient number of copies of the printed supplement to the record be filed with the Clerk.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merle Phillips, Petitioner,
1011 vs.
W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, etc.

On consideration of a motion to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merle Phillips,

Petitioner,

1011 vs.

W. I. Biddle, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, etc.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein by direction of the Court shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Foster Kelton and Herbert Kelton,

Plaintiffs in error,

220 vs.

Wallace Kelton.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Humboldt Land & Cattle Company,

Appellant,

671 vs.

Robert A. Allen, as State Engineer of the State of Nevada and individually, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and

Allan Pinkerton, doing business as
Pinkertons' National Detective Agency
and The Corporations Auxiliary Company,
Appellants,
246 vs.
Eugene Wengert, John W. Woller, George
Page, and Charles Reichenbach.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New York,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago,

Upon consideration of several motions and suggestions filed in this cause by the respective parties, It is ordered:

1. The answer heretofore filed by the defendants in this cause to the bill of complaint in the related case of State of Michigan v. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago may and shall be accepted and treated as their answer to the bill of complaint in this cause, other than Paragraph III thereof;

2. The motion of the defendants in this cause to strike from the bill of complaint Paragraph III thereof is set down for hearing on Monday, next, at the head of the cases assigned for that day; and

3. The motion of the complainants for an order requiring the defendants in this cause to answer Paragraph III of the bill of complaint is deferred untill after the motion of the defendants to strike out that Paragraph is heard and disposed of.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 869 vs. Ole Berkeness. — Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, 916 vs. C. H. Priester. — Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, 958 vs. C. H. Priester. — Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred M. Kirby, Petitioner, 929 vs. The United States. — Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
930 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Smith, Subiaco and Rock Island Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
946 vs.
Emma Moore, Administratrix of the Estate of William Moore, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Edison Company,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus, Bertha Genevieve Bottoms, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut,
Petitioner,
964 vs.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, Joseph Plant, et al., Executors.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Fairfield County of the State of Connecticut, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Wright,
Petitioner,
914 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Orlov,
Petitioner,
924 vs.
Harry Sawyer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Rex Amusement Company,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
Marianita Truschel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Bowman-Hicks Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. Glenn N. Robinson. 931

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Drew Haven Dunn, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 939

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William L. Barnard, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 943

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustave Henry and William Henry,
Petitioners,
945 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace Liska Pons, Agnes Lois Pons,
Jessie Kittle Pons, etc., et al.
Petitioners,
947 vs.
State Bank & Trust Company, Guardian,
United States of America, Bureau of
War Risk Insurance.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sigmund Stern,
Petitioner,
950 vs.
Empire Gas and Fuel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Willite Company,
Petitioner,
952 vs.
Trinidad Asphalt Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Agent, under Section 206 of the Transportation Act of 1920 (New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad,)
Petitioner,
953 vs.
New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

May Berg and Frederick C. Raichley,
Petitioners,
954 vs.
Harry J. Merchant and Clyde C. Smith, as Executors of Last Will and Testament of Burr Raichley, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Adelaide McColgan, as Administratrix with the Will Annexed of the Estate of Daniel A. McColgan, deceased,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
Charles H. Clark and Edward Bergner, as Trustees in Bankruptcy of Albert E. Snyder, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel M. Howe, Administratrix of the Estate of Fred C. Howe, deceased,
Petitioner,
959 vs.
Michigan Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vernon S. Story,
Petitioner,
960 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal,
Petitioner,
963 vs.
John Busch.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Watson,
Petitioner,
967 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

It is now here ordered by this Court that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, April 29th next, and the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 2nd, until Monday, May 16th next.

No petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions except motions for admissions to practice will be received after Tuesday, May 31st next.

Hugo Thorsch,
Appellant,
1068 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

"I, Henry W. Hodges, Clerk of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Hugo Thorsch was appellant, and Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, were appellees, No. 4130, a final decree was rendered by said Court of Appeals on the 6th day of April, A. D. 1925, in favor of the said appellees, and against the said appellant, and that on the 13th day of June, A. D. 1925, said appellant prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

"In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Court of Appeals, at the City of Washington, this 22nd day of March, A. D. 1927.

(SEAL) /s/ Henry W. Hodges,
Clerk,"

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Twin City Forge & Foundry Company,
Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
134 vs.
The United States.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the appellee, and he having moved the Court to remand the cause in accordance with the stipulation of counsel filed herein,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims, with directions to that Court to modify its

judgment by reducing the amount awarded to the United States to the sum of $47,663.23, together with costs in the said Court of Claims.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
291 vs.
The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania.

The motion for leave to file a brief of William Graupner as amicus curiae in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Y. Ivens, and the motion was denied.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
2, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to fix compensation of the special master in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Warren, the special master appointed by the Court, herein.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
505 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing in these cases.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
872 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.
Standard Oil Company, Inc., in Kentucky,
Petitioner,
873 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

The joint motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Helm Bruce for the petitioner in No. 872, and for the respondent in No. 873, and by Mr. Charles G. Middleton for the respondent in No. 872, and for the petitioner in No. 873.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twelfth Pennsylvania District, Petitioner,
297 vs.
International Salt Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief for the American Pneumatic Service Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

J. H. Lane & Company, Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. White, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

Charles Bossio and Tony Bossio, Petitioners,
956 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. G. Graves for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The People of Sioux County, Nebraska, Petitioner,
981 vs.
National Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier and Mr. Edwin D. Crites for the petitioner.

John O'Fallon, Petitioner,
987 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neal E. McNeill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Geo. D. Richardson Machinery Company, Petitioner, 988 vs. Mrs. Annie Scott, Administratrix of the Estate of John A. Scott, deceased.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. H. Linebaugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jean H. Everest and Mr. Chas. L. Moore for the respondent.
The Lakewood Engineering Company and Edward G. Carr, Petitioners, 990 vs. A. W. French & Co., Alfred W. French, Edwin A. Allen, et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Dennett for the petitioners, and by Mr. Rudolph William Lotz and Mr. Arthur William Nelson for the respondents.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Petitioner, 993 vs. George I. Rockwood.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Delano Putnam and Mr. Alex Lincoln for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Hovey Gage for the respondent.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Petitioner, 994 vs. George I. Rockwood.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Delano Putnam and Mr. Alex Lincoln for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Hovey Gage for the respondent.

First National Bank in St. Louis and Joseph D. Bascom,
Petitioners,
995 vs.
Wm. Buder, as Assessor of the City of St. Louis, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. Taylor Bryan, Mr. Frank Sullivan, and Mr. Sam B. Jeffries for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. W. Foristel, Mr. Oliver Senti, Mr. North T. Gentry, Mr. Charles P. Williams, Mr. James T. Blair, and Mr. Julius T. Muench for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1001 vs.
Amalia Manzi.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
1008 vs.
Millers' National Federation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Bayard T. Hainer, and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. Stephen A. Foster, and Mr. Karl D. Loos for the respondents.

The United States ex rel. Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Louis Titus for the petitioner.

H. W. Hess,
Plaintiff in error,
263 vs.
Leo Pawloski, a minor, proceeding by his next friend, Stanislaw Pawloski.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Gowen Parry for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Baltimore Steamship Company and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioners,
271 vs.
Vernon Phillips, an infant, by his guardian ad litem.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur M. Boal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edgar J. Treacy for the respondent.

The State of Ohio ex rel. James Clarke, Plaintiff in error,
272 vs.
Alfred F. Deckebach, as Auditor of the City of Cincinnati.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George S. Hawke for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Myron H. Avery, Esquire, of Luber, State of Maine, and Jerry C. Massey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold A. Ritz, It is ordered that Henry D. Rummel and Donald O. Blagg, Esquires, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant, It is ordered that Georgia Hare, of Groton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. C. Sullivan, It is ordered that Gustav Lange, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Douglas D. Storey, It is ordered that Alton W. Lick, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, It is ordered that Albert Levitt, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Virginia, and George Baillie Springston, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John V. Sees, It is ordered that S. Sidney Stein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that William Davis Conrad, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to substitute Thomas W. Phillips, Jr., H. J. Crawford, J. V. Ritts, et al., as members of the board of directors of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, as the party plaintiff in error in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Courtby Mr. C. B. Ames and Mr. C. B. Cochran for the plaintiff in error, and the substitution was consented to by Mr. Edwin Denby, Mr. E. S. Ratliff, and Mr. J. D. Lydick for the defendants in error.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
280 vs.
Leah M. Gray, Administratrix of the Estate of Glen E. Gray.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merrill Shurtliff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hollis R. Bailey for the respondent.

State of Ohio ex rel. James Clarke,
Plaintiff in error,
272 vs.
Alfred F. Deckebach, as Auditor of the City of Cincinnati.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George S. Hawkes for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. J. D. Ellis for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George S. Hawkes for the plaintiff in error.

Benjamin H. Clark and Charles Riggs, a partnership, etc.,
Appellants,
275 vs.
George T. Poore et al., constituting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the appellants, and by Mr. Albert M. Calland and Mr. John W. Bricker for the appellees.

Schuman Brothers, a Copartnership, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
278 vs.
First National Bank of Skiatook.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. L. Yancey for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
279 vs.
American Tobacco Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reeve Lewis, It is ordered that Frank Parker Davis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Milton Tibbetts, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, and Clarence S. Walker, Esquire, of Malden, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Walter Lewis Moll, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, It is ordered that Merrill Spencer June, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis A. Cramton, It is ordered that William Robert Walsh, Esquire, of Port Huron, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. S. Spilman, It is ordered that George Lee Basye, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court, in this behalf by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, It is ordered that Herbert A. Friedlich, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul F. Myers, It is ordered that Sam T. Swansen, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
279 vs.
American Tobacco Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner.

Arkansas Railroad Commission and W. H. Donham, as Prosecuting Attorney, etc.,
Appellants,
549 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific R. R. Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward A. Haid for the appellants, and by Mr. Thomas S. Busbee for the appellee.

Quaker City Cab Company,
Plaintiff in error,
691 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause was argued by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John Robert Jones for the defendant in error. Leave was granted the defendant in error to file a brief within one week.

J. F. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
894 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellants, and continued by Mr. C. B. Stuart for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that George H. Muckley and James R. Bell, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Anthony F. McCue, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that Clarence A. Shuey, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Warner M. Pomerene, Esquire, of Coshocton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity, It is ordered that James M. Gorman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilbur F. Denious, It is ordered that Ernest B. Fowler, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
897 vs.
International Salt Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Elmont B. Hazard in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of George E. Holmes and Randolph E. Paul as amici curiae in this cause.

J. P. Lawrence et al.,
Appellants,
894 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. C. B. Stuart for the appellee.

Hope Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
815 vs.
Grant P. Hall, State Tax Commissioner of West Virginia, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the defendants in error.

Gould-Mersereau Company,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
Williams Bros. Aircraft Corporation.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William S. Pritchard for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Gould-Morsereau Company,
Petitioner,
283 vs.
Williams Bros. Aircraft Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for reconsideration with special regard to the decision in the case of Alexander Milbourne Company v. Davis-Bournonville Company, 270 U. S. 390.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Overland Motor Company,
285 vs.
Packard Motor Car Company and Wire Wheel Corporation of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Melville Church for the Overland Motor Company, and by Mr. Frank Parker Davis for the Packard Motor Car Company and Wire Wheel Corporation of America.

The United States,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
Charles A. Ludy,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. T. L. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire. Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Herman Dehnke, Esquire, of Harrisville, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry Clay Pierce,
Plaintiff in error,
294 vs.
W. J. Barker, J. W. Tartar and Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Roger Shale in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the plaintiff in error when received, and to submit the case on his behalf when reached.

The United States,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
Charles A. Ludy.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. T. L. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioner.

James Stewart & Company, Plaintiff in error, 290 vs. Dominick Rivera.	This cause was argued by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Harrington Putnam for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James M. Gorman for the defendant in error.
The United States, Petitioner, 291 vs. The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Hampton Barnes and Mr. John F. McCarron for the respondent.
Carrie Buck, by R. G. Shelton, her guardian and next friend, Plaintiff in error, 292 vs. J. H. Bell, Superintendent.	This cause was argued by Mr. I. P. Whitehead for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. A. E. Strode for the defendant in error.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Weiner, It is ordered that P. Nicholas Petrocelli, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Thomas J. Lanshe, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Lanke, It is ordered that Israel B. Greene, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hudson Moore, It is ordered that Jean S. Breitenstein, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan H. Beach, It is ordered that Robert A. Hutchison, Esquire, of Manassas, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph J. Kelley, It is ordered that N. Louis Paladeau, Jr., and Joseph J. Carissimi, Esquires, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Irwin, It is ordered that Eugene D. Saunders and T. Semmes Walmsley, Esquires, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that E. G. Potter, Esquire, of Smethport, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that James J. Lenihan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West, It is ordered that Robert Neill Maxey, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, It is ordered that Paul Pinson, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, It is ordered that Allan G. Carson, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James Duignan, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and Pall Mall Realty Corporation. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

No. 6, Original.—October Term, 1926.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

Decree Announced April 25, 1927.

On consideration of the fourth report of the commissioners, heretofore selected to run, locate and mark portions of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the south bank of the Red River, showing that they have run, located and marked particular portions of such boundary between the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, and the eastern boundary of the State of Oklahoma, which fourth report was presented herein February 21, 1927;

And no objection or exception to such report being presented, although the time therefor has expired;

It is now adjudged, ordered and decreed as follows:

1. The said report is in all respects confirmed;

2. The boundary line delineated and set forth in the said report and on the accompanying maps is established and declared to be the true boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River at the several places designated in such report, subject, however, to such changes as hereafter may be wrought by the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion as specified in the second, third and fourth paragraphs of the decree rendered herein March 12, 1923, (261 U. S. 340);

3. The clerk of this Court shall transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the States of Texas and Oklahoma copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the seal of this Court, together with copies of the said fourth report and of the accompanying maps.

4 As it appears that the commissioners appointed to run, locate and mark portions of the boundary along the south bank of the

5. The clerk of this Court shall distribute and deliver to the Chief Magistrates of the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the Secretary of the Interior all copies of the first, second, third and fourth boundary reports made by the commissioners, with the accompanying maps, now in the clerk's hands, save that he shall retain twenty copies of each for purposes of certification and other needs that may arise in his office.

6. Except as otherwise specially ordered by this Court, the costs in this cause pertaining to the adjudication and settlement of the boundary between the two States along the Red River shall be borne in equal parts by the State of Oklahoma, the State of Texas and the United States.

No. 6, Original.—October Term, 1926.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, United States, Intervener.

Order Announced April 25, 1927.

The report filed herein March 14, 1927, by the boundary commissioners showing the work done, time employed and expenses incurred in the survey, marking and mapping of particular portions of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the south bank of the Red River, from the eastern limit of Lamar County, Texas, to the eastern boundary of the State of Oklahoma, pursuant to the decree of March 12, 1923, (261 U. S. 340) is approved and adopted. The compensation of the commissioners for the work done by them, as shown in such report, is fixed at $8,937.50 for Arthur D. Kidder, and at $11,525.00 for Arthur A. Stiles. The expenses incurred, as shown in the report, and the compensation here allowed shall be charged as part of the costs in this cause and shall be borne and paid by the three parties to the cause in the proportions specified in said decree of March 12, 1923. The parties severally shall be credited with the amounts advanced by them, as shown in the report; and they shall advance additional amounts to pay the compensation of the commissioners, as here allowed, and the balance of $694.25 due to Arthur D. Kidder for expenses paid by him, as shown in the report.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
872 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company, Incorporated in Kentucky, Petitioner,
873 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a Corporation, Plaintiff in error,
187 vs.
The State of Oklahoma, the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

On consideration of a motion to substitute Thomas W. Phillips, Jr. et al., as members of and constituting the board of directors and trustees of the Oklahoma Gas Company, a dissolved corporation, as the party plaintiff in error in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
280 vs.
Leah M. Gray, Administratrix of the Estate of Glen E. Gray.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was

argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire, for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Schuman Brothers, a Corpartnership,
Consisting of Morris Schuman and
Joseph M. Schuman,
Plaintiffs in error,
278 vs.
The First National Bank of Skiatook.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed ~~under section 237 of the Judicial Code as amended by the act of February 13, 1925, 43 Stat. 936.~~ for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Schuman Brothers, a Copartnership,
Consisting of Morris Schuman and
Joseph M. Schuman,
Plaintiffs in error,
278 vs.
The First National Bank of Skiatook.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Agustin Segurola and Manuel Santiago, Petitioners,
980 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of Sioux County, Nebraska, Petitioner,
981 vs.
National Surety Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. O. Richardson Machinery Company, Petitioner,
988 vs.
Mrs. Annie Scott, Administratrix of the Estate of John A. Scott, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lakewood Engineering Company and Edward G. Carr, Petitioners,
990 vs.
A. W. French & Co., Alfred W. French, Edwin A. Allen, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxations of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Petitioner,
993 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, of the State of Massachusetts, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Petitioner,
994 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester of the State of Massachusetts, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1001 vs.
Amalia Manzi.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Spiritualists Association, Petitioner,
970 vs.
Sarah A. Vestal, Robert Ingersol Jackson, Wm. A. Jackson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maggie Kemmerer, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
971 vs.
Reading Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnetic Manufacturing Company and John P. Bethke, Petitioners,
972 vs.
Dings Magnetic Separator Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Redondo Steamship Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The Archibald McNeil & Sons Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

973

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, Petitioners, vs. North Side Canal Company, Limited, and The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

974

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Board of Equalization of the State of Wyoming, Maurice Groshon, E. J. Carroll, Petitioners, vs. Twin Falls Canal Company and The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

975

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Board of Equalization of the
State of Wyoming, Maurice Gresham,
E. J. Carroll, Petitioners,
976 vs.
North Side Canal Limited Company and The
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Board of Equalization of the
State of Wyoming, Maurice Gresham,
E. J. Carroll, Petitioners,
977 vs.
Twin Falls Canal Company and the
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Securities Company,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
The Michigan Central Railroad Company and the New York Central
Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Alama Foods Company,
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Alexander S. Walker, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shur-On Optical Company, Inc., and
Shur-On Standard Optical Company, Inc.,
Petitioners,
984 vs.
American Optical Company and Channing M. Wells, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kirstein Optical Company, Inc.,
and Shur-On Standard Optical
Company, Inc.,
Petitioners,
985 vs.
American Optical Company and
Channing M. Wells, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

J. H. Lane & Company,

Petitioner,

951 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Bossio and Tony Bossio,

Petitioners,

956 vs.

United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John O'Fallon,

Petitioner,

987 vs.

United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis
and Joseph D. Bascom,
Petitioners,
995 vs.
Wm. Buder, as Assessor of the City
of St. Louis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
1008 vs.
Millers' National Federation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hooper,
Petitioner,
991 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company,
Lakewood Engineering Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
990 vs.
A. W. French & Co., et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, to be heard upon the question of the action of the Court below in so far as it dismissed the appeals because the transcripts of record did not comply with Equity Rule 75.

It is now further ordered by this Court that no other questions involved in these cases will be heard at that time.

Counsel may govern themselves accordingly in respect to printing here.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manassas Battlefield Confederate Park, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
398 vs.
B. Lynn Robertson, W. E. Trussler, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morgan H. Beach for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. W. R. Ewing and Mr. Charles A. Douglas for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Investors Syndicate,
Plaintiff in error,
293 vs.
Adam McMullen as Governor, etc., et al.,

On motion made to the Court by Mr. A. C. Spencer for the plaintiff in error, Clarence G. Bliss, as secretary of the Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska, was substituted as a party defendant in error in the place of Kirk Griggs, formerly secretary of the Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska, per stipulation of counsel.

No. 1018. T. H. Smallwood et al., petitioner, v. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 1019. Adolfo Valdes Ordonez et al., petitioners, v. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 1020. Insular Motor Corporations, petitioner, v. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 1021. Adolfo Valdes et al., petitioners, v. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 1022. Finlay, Waymouth & Lee, Inc., petitioner, v. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Angel Abarca Portilla et al.,
Petitioners,
1023 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William B. Pistole in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief in these cases for the respondent within nine days from this date.

George R. Dale,
Plaintiff in error,
656 vs.
The State of Indiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Moses E. Clapp for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert P. Scripps, as Executor of the Last Willand Testament of E. W. Scripps, deceased,
Petitioner,
986 vs.
Robert Moran.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Consaul and Mr. Charles C. Heltman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Hulbert and Mr. Oscar Lawler for the respondent.

Leroy Allebach and D. N. Mohler,
Petitioners,
997 vs.
S. B. Thomas, Trustee in Bankruptcy for H. G. Nicholson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Kemp Morton for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. C. Townsend for the respondent.

Francesco Lidonnici, Serverio Desiderio, Giovanni Candioti et al.,
Petitioners,
998 vs.
James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McNeill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondents.

George Appell,
Petitioner,
1005 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellwood P. Morey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Charles I. Daniels,
Petitioner,
1007 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. P. Henshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Great Western Power Company,
Petitioner,
1010 vs.
Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. D. Madison, Mr. Alfred Sutro, Mr. H. D. Pillsbury, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the respondent.

Robert G. Martin, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Jacob Rahn, deceased,
Petitioner,
1012 vs.
George Ahrens, German Consul General of Germany, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Franken for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davies for the respondents.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
1016 vs.
Oesterlein Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the petitioner, and by Mr. John J. Hamilton and Mr. Robert H. Miller for the respondent.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix of Edward D. Untermyer,
Petitioner,
1056 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

W. T. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, under section 237-c of the Judicial Code as amended by the act of February 13, 1925, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn, Mr. Robert M. Rainey, Mr. David A. Richardson, and Mr. Samuel W. Hayes for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the petition, and by Mr. Edwin D. Dabney and Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

T. H. Deal and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company of Baltimore, Petitioners,
344 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, pursuant to the twenty-third rule, by Mr. Louis S. Beedy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Letts, Mr. J. Kennedy White, and Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.

S. M. Gorieb, Petitioner,
799 vs.
Charles D. Fox, et al. members of the City Counsel of Roanoke, Virginia, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, pursuant to the twenty-third rule, by Mr. G. A. Wingfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles D. Fox for the respondents.

James Willos, Plaintiff in error,
864 vs.
State of Oregon.

The motion to dismiss this cause, pursuant to the nineteenth rule, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan G. Carson for the defendant in error, and the consideration of the motion was postponed until the case is reached in its regular order on the call.

Gilliland Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
583 vs.
The State of Arkansas, ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. W. Hendricks for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. W. Applegate, Mr. J. S. Utley, and Mr. William T. Hammock for the defendant in error.

State of New York,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

This cause was argued on the motion to strike out Paragraph III of the bill of complaint of the State of New York, by Mr. James M. Beck for the defendant, Sanitary District of Chicago, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Investors Syndicate,
Plaintiff in error,
293 vs.
Adam McMullen as Governor, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Henry Clay Pierce,
Plaintiff in error,
294 vs.
W. J. Barker et al., etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. L. McIntosh for the defendants in error, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Fowler for the plaintiff in error.

Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
295 vs.
The State of Texas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rush H. Holland for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

David W. Phillips, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
297 vs.
International Salt Company.

This cause was argued by . Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry B. Twombly for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newell W. Ellison, It is ordered that Faber J. Drukenbrod and Everett L. Mills, Esquires, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Mitchell, It is ordered that Clarence V. S. Mitchell and Charles Garside, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Thomas D. Walton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Clarence Alvin Warren, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. McClintock, It is ordered that Henry W. Harter, Jr., Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
844 vs.
John R. Haney and F. J. Sullivan.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. Sherman Joines,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
William M. Patterson et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. William G. Davisson for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondent. On motion made to the Court by Mr. William G. Davisson in that behalf, leave was granted to file a reply brief on behalf of the petitioner within one week after the brief for the respondent has been received.

Independent Coal and Coke Company and Carbon County Land Company, Petitioners,

300 vs.

The United States and Carbon County.

This cause was argued by Mr. Mahlon E. Wilson for petitioner, Independent Coal and Coke Company; by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent, the United States, and by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for petitioner, Carbon County Land Company.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the name of Mitchell Gin Company, Appellant,

375 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. M. Rainey for the appellant, and continued by Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan H. Beach, It is ordered that Thomas R. Keith, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Parsons, It is ordered that George H. Fernald, Jr., Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Fred Horowitz, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Manassas Battlefield Confederate Park, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
398 vs.
B. Lynn Robertson et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. E. W. R. Ewing for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file a brief for the plaintiffs in error in opposition to the motion to dismiss.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the name of Mitchell Gin Company,
Appellant,
375 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn in that behalf, C. C. Childress, as a member of the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, and Edwin B. Dabney, as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, were substituted in the places of E. R. Hughes, formerly a member of the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, and George F. Short, formerly Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, as parties appellees.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the name of Mitchell Gin Company,
Appellant,
375 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the appellant.

Will Norris,
Plaintiff in error,
794 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Owsley Stanley and Mr. George Wesley Smith for the plaintiff in error.
On motion made to the Court by Mr. M. M. Irwin for the defendant in error, leave was granted to file a brief for the defendant in error within five days from this date.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
851 vs.
Manly S. Sullivan.

On motion made to the Court by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt in that behalf, leave was granted to Mr. Frederick W. Aley to appear and present oral argument for the respondent, pro hac vice.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
851 vs.
Manly S. Sullivan.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick W. Aley, pro hac vice, for the respondent.

James Willos,
Plaintiff in error,
864 vs.
State of Oregon.

The motion to pass this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the motion was denied.

This cause was argued by Mr. Allan G. Carson for the defendant in error, and leave was granted to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a brief within twenty days from to-day, in support of his assignments of errors.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
880 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners.
Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
881 vs.
State of Louisiana.
Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
882 vs.
State of Louisiana.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Donelson Caffery for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. M. M. Irwin, Mr. E. D. Saunders, and Mr. T. Semmes Walmsley for the defendants in error.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, It is ordered that Yale L. Schekter, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond T. Mawhinney, It is ordered that Robert W. Hardie, Esquire, of Fanwood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. H. Sullivan, It is ordered that William R. Montgomery, Esquire, of Edinburg, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Bissell Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error,
317 vs.
Theodore Fehrman.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore W. Brazeau and Mr. B. H. Coggins for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. F. J. Smith for the defendant in error.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
880 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
881 vs.
State of Louisiana.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
882 vs.
State of Louisiana.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Donelson Caffery for the plaintiffs in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
983 vs.
D. J. Alford.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. W. Williams for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

David Atkins,
Plaintiff in error,
992 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. L. Mills for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue, Ben F. Wright, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
363 vs.
The City of Manila.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William C. Rigby in that behalf, leave was granted O. R. McGuire to appear and present oral argument for the petitioners, pro hac vice in this cause.

Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue, Ben F. Wright, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
363 vs.
The City of Manila.

This cause was argued by Mr. O. R. McGuire and Mr. William C. Rigby for the petitioners, and by Mr. G. B. Guevara for the respondent.

Edward C. Twist,

Petitioner,

301 vs.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

Edward C. Twist, Albert T. Twist, and Jessie L. Payne, nee Twist,

Petitioners,

302 vs.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Paul Pinson for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Preston C. West for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that L. W. Crawhall, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., It is ordered that J. M. Wells, Jr., Esquire, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark, It is ordered that Ralph P. Colin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Appell,
Petitioner,
1005 vs.
The United States of America.
Charles I. Daniels,
Petitioner,
1007 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. E. P. Morey in that behalf, leave was granted to file a memorandum on behalf of the petitioner in No. 1005, provided the same is presented today.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
880 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners.
Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
881 vs.
State of Louisiana.
Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
882 vs.
State of Louisiana.

The motion for leave to file an additional brief on behalf of the plaintiffs in error was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellsworth Alvord, in behalf of Mr. Donelson Caffery, and the motion was denied.

Edward C. Twist,
Petitioner,
301 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.
Edward C. Twist, Albert T. Twist, and Jessie L. Payne, nee Twist,
Petitioner,
302 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Preston C. West for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Paul Pinson for the petitioners.

Foster Cline, as District Attorney for the City and County of Denver, State of Colorado, Appellant,
304 vs.
Frink Dairy Company, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jean S. Breitenstein for the appellant, and by Mr. Hudson Moore and Mr. Ernest B. Fowler for the appellees.

Midland Oil Company, Plaintiff in error,
308 vs.
Benjamin Ball.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. H. Hawkes for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills,
313 vs.
City of Piedmont et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John G. Milburn for the Real Silk Hosiery Mills, and by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the City of Piedmont et al., with leave to counsel to file a brief on behalf of the City of Piedmont within five days from this date.

Empire Trust Company, Petitioner,
318 vs.
Charles Hazlitt Cahan.

This cause was argued by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., for the respondent.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, It is ordered that C. Blake McDowell and Edwin W. Brouse, Esquires, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Elisha Hanson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Fred H. Aldrich, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Ethel K. Childers, of Arkansas City, State of Kansas, and Elton W. Stanley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Dorothy Marie Rehfeld, of Aberdeen, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Dennett, It is ordered that Frederic Newburgh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Edgar L. Burchell, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Hardy Todd, It is ordered that Charles L. Black, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Liggett & Myers Tobacco Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 362

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said ~~United States Circuit Court of Appeals~~ Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Robert David Kercheval, otherwise called "Bob" Kercheval, otherwise called "Dave" Kercheval,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Concurring Mr. Justice Stone.

Burnrite Coal Briquette Company,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
Edward G. Riggs, Alfred L. Kirby, and John P. Duffy, Receivers, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Carrie Buck, by R. G. Shelton, her Guardian and next friend, Plaintiff in error, vs. J. H. Bell, Superintendent of the State Colony for Epileptics and Feeble Minded. 292

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

ORDER

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 2, Original

On consideration of the report of Charles Warren, Esquire, the special master herein, respecting the services rendered by him as such special master; It is ordered and decreed by the Court that the amount of the compensation of such special master for his services rendered herein be fixed at the sum of thirty-five hundred dollars, and that one-half of the same be paid by each of the parties hereto.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manassas Battlefield Confederate Park, Inc.; E. W. R. Ewing, its President, etc., et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. B. Lynn Robertson, W. E. Trussler, E. S. Hynson, et al., etc., et al. 398

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Joseph G. Saunders,
Petitioner.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is, hereby, denied without prejudice to a petition for a writ of certiorari to be filed within the limitation of the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gilliland Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
583 vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Investors Syndicate,
Plaintiff in error,
293 vs.
Adam McMullen, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, and Kirk Griggs, as Secretary of the Department of Trade and Commerce, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Clay Pierce,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

294 vs. State of Wisconsin.

W. J. Barker, J. W. Tartar, and

Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Company, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Civil Appeals Seventh Supreme Judicial District,

295 vs. State of Texas.

The State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Seventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twelfth Pennsylvania District,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

297 vs.

International Salt Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, for further proceedings in

W. A. Frost, doing business under
the name of Mitchell Gin Company,
Appellant,
375 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State
of Oklahoma, Fred Capshaw, Frank
Carter, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will Norris,
Plaintiff in error,
794 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
880 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Medical
Examiners.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

881

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Fife and Walter W. Fife,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

882

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bissell Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Theodore Fehrman.

In error to the Circuit Court of Lincoln County, State of Wisconsin.

317

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Lincoln County of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Atkins,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

992 vs. the State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Atkins,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

992 vs. the State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio.

The Court having treated the writ of error in this cause as an application for a writ of certiorari, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that a writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Midland Oil Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

308 vs. the State of Oklahoma.

Benjamin Ball.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. T. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. T. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error,
154 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
1016 vs.
Oesterlien Machine Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
1056 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector, etc.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert P. Scripps, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of E. W. Scripps, deceased, Petitioner,
986 vs.
Robert Moran.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leroy Allebach and D. M. Mohler, Petitioner,
997 vs.
S. B. Thomas, Trustee in Bankruptcy for H. G. Nicholson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francesco Lidonnici, Serverio
Desiderio, et al., Petitioners,
998 vs.
James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor,
and W. W. Husband, Commissioner of
Immigration, U. S.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Appell, Petitioner,
1005 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles I. Daniels, Petitioner,
1007 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Western Power Company,
Petitioner,
1010 vs.
Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert G. Martin, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Jacob Rahn, deceased,
Petitioner,
1012 vs.
George Ahrens, German Consul General of Germany at St. Louis, Missouri, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

It is now here ordered by this Court that the Court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 6th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

It is ordered that rules 30 and 31 of this Court be amended so that they shall read as follows:

30

REHEARING

A petition for rehearing may be filed with the Clerk, in term time or

in vacation, within twenty-five days after judgment is entered, but not later, and must be printed, briefly and distinctly state its grounds, and be supported by a certificate of counsel to the effect that it is presented in good faith and not for delay. Such a petition is not subject to oral argument, and will not be granted unless a Justice who concurred in the judgment desires it and a majority of the Court so determines.

31

MANDATES

Mandates shall issue as of course after the expiration of twenty-five days from the date the judgment is entered, irrespective of the filing of a petition for rehearing, unless the time is shortened or enlarged by order of the Court, or of a justice when the Court is not in session. See rule 29, Paragraph 5.

This amendment shall take effect and be enforced on and after October 3, 1927.

W. I. Biddle, as Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas,
771 vs.
Vuco Perovich.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell that Thomas B. White, as Warden etc., be substituted in the place of W. I. Biddle, formerly Warden, etc., as a party herein, It is now here ordered that the motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

103 Park Avenue Company,
Plaintiff in error,
579 vs.
The Exchange Buffet Corporation et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville D. Church in behalf of Mr. Clifton V. Edwards, Mr. George P. Nicholson, and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James R. Deering for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
Appellant,
234 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing in this cause.

The motion to grant the appellant time to print evidence supporting a motion for a rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and the motion denied.

George McNeir,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, U. S. Collector etc.,

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell L. Bradford for the petitioner.

Harry B. Stilz,
Petitioner.
——.

The motion for leave to file in the Court of Claims a petition in the nature of a bill of review, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry B. Stilz, pro se.

Eaton, Brown & Simpson, Inc.,
Petitioner,
955 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond N. Beebe, Mr. Joseph E. Davies, and Mr. Franklin D. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Percy M. Cox for the respondent.

The Texas Company et al.,
Petitioners,
1013 vs.
Rosenthal-Brown Fur Company, Inc., and Charles W. Brown.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. P. Pujo, Mr. Hampden Story, and Mr. Fred L. Williams for the petitioners.

Edward A. McLaughlin, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Leon M. Prince.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, pro se, and by Mr. Arthur M. Boal for the respondent.

V. L. Highland,
Petitioner,
1015 vs.
Russell Car & Snow Plow Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioner.

T. H. Smallwood, W. P. Smallwood, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1018 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.
Adolfo Valdes Ordonez, Salvador Garcia, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1019 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.
Insular Motor Corporation,
Petitioner,
1020 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the petitioners.

Adolfo Valdes, Pio Perez, et al.,
Petitioners,
1021 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the petitioners.

Finlay, Waymouth & Lee, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1022 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Angel Abarca Portilla, Rafael Abarca Portilla, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1023 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

The Pullman Company,
Petitioner,
1024 vs.
Paul Montimore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. McCormick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Perry J. Leurs and Mr. H. C. Carter for the respondent.

Thompson-Starrett Company,
Petitioner,
1025 vs.
LaBelle Iron Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. W. D. Stewart for the respondent.

Beaver County,
Petitioner,
1026 vs.
South Utah Mines & Smelters.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. A. Hilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr., Mr. C. C. Parson, and Mr. L. F. Adamson for the respondent.

The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1027 vs.
Gilbert J. Contois.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney J. Brooks and Mr. Walter P. Napier for the petitioner, and by Mr. Perry J. Lewis and Mr. H. C. Carter for the respondent.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1028 vs.
Barrett Gibson, administrator.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. H. Prendergast for the petitioner.

Harry Levy, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
1029 vs.
Industrial Finance Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. M. Brandt for the petitioner.

Guy K. Mitchell, Executor of Annie M. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
1030 vs.
Norman T. Nelson, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Hayden for the petitioner.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke,
Petitioner,
1031 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. L. Becker & Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Johnston for the petitioner.

Mabel Ludlam,
Petitioner,
1034 vs.
Leigh Arey Channon, Executrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Topliff, Mr. Homer H. Cooper, and Mr. Wm. H. Wherry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin H. Cassels and Mr. Ralph F. Potter for the respondent.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
1035 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.
C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue etc..
Petitioner,
1036 vs.
The Colonia Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. C. Allen, Mr. I. J. Underwood, Mr. Charles Alvin Jones, and Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the respondent.

Dinshah P. Ghadiali,
Petitioner,
1049 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dinshah P. Ghadiali, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely

Frank White,
Petitioner,
1091 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank White, pro se.

George Nancy et al.,
Petitioner,
1092 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Nancy, pro se.

Thomas B. White, as Warden, etc.,
771 vs.
Vuco Perovich.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicito General Mitchell for White, as Warden, and by Mr. George T. McDermott for Perovich.

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is ordered that Louis L. Boehmen, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that Edward Dinkelspiel, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac Lobe Straus, It is ordered that J. Paul Schmidt, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Russell Bowen, It is ordered that Edwin D. Detwiler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Harry Miles Keyser, Esquire, of East Falls Church, State of Virginia, and Henry Wise Kelly, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, It is ordered that Willard Brooks, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas; David Ernst Hudson and Karl T. Frederick, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, It is ordered that Livingston E. Osborne, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Harold Baxter, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Bramhall, It is ordered that Ottilia A. Betschart, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri; Wm. B. Wright, Esquire, of Cherrydale, State of Virginia, and Frank Schwartz, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will T. Gordon, It is ordered that Robert E. Church, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Wendell, It is ordered that William W. Stewart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Clark, It is ordered that W. S. Welch, Esquire, of Laurel, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that E. C. Marianelli, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Tyler, It is ordered that Louis H. Kupfer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, It is ordered that Landgon H. Larwill, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Witter, It is ordered that Alfred J. Schweppe, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Claude L. Smith, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Gustave L. Goldstein, and Harry Steiner, Esquires, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic C. McKenney, It is ordered that John E. Larson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fort Smith Light and Traction
Company, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
269 vs. State of Arkansas.
Board of Improvement of Paving
District No. 16 of the City of Fort
Smith, Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The State of Ohio ex rel. James
Clarke, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
272 vs. State of Ohio.
Alfred F. Deckebach, as Auditor of
the City of Cincinnati.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States,
Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court
291 vs. of Claims.
The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing
Company of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Joseph Seeman, Sigel W. Seeman,
Sylvan L. Stix, et al., etc.
Petitioners,
198 vs.
Philadelphia Warehouse Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in error,
3 vs.
The People of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division 1, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division 1, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Harold B. Fiske,

Plaintiff in error,

48 vs.

The State of Kansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and the cause remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

William Burns,

Plaintiff in error,

135 vs.

The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles H. Phelps, as surviving partner of Howard Phelps and Charles H. Phelps, copartners, trading under the firm name, etc.,

Petitioners,

531 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this

the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Great Northern Railway Company, Northern Pacific Railway Company, and Spokane International Railway Company,

Petitioners,

242 vs.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Idaho.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

H. W. Hess,

Plaintiff in error,

263 vs.

Leo Pawloski, Minor, proceeding by his father and next friend, Stanislaw Pawloski.

In error to the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Worcester County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Baltimore Steamship Company and
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioners,
271 vs.
Vernon Phillips, an infant, by
Vernon Phillips, his Guardian ad litem.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Stone.

Hector M. Zahn and A. W. Ross,
Plaintiffs in error,
196 vs.
Board of Public Works of the City
of Los Angeles, Charles H. Treat,
Hugh McGuire, and E. J. Delorey,
etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States,

Petitioner,

vs.

Charles A. Ludy.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

289

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,

Petitioners,

vs.

E. P. Spiller, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

577

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
200 vs.
Sisal Sales Corporation, Charles D. Orth, Alvin W. Krech, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and the cause remanded for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

T. H. Deal and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company of Baltimore, Petitioners,
344 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Alaska for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Hope Natural Gas Company,

Plaintiff in error,

815 vs.

Grant P. Hall, State Tax Commissioner of West Virginia, and Howard B. Lee, Attorney General of West Virginia.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Harry R. Alston,

898 vs.

The United States of America.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

~~for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.~~

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Leopold Zimmermann, Louis J. Rees,
Maryan H. Hauser, John S. Scully,
et al., Appellants,
180 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property
Custodian of the United States;
Frank White, as Treasurer of the
United States; and the Wiener Bank-
Verein of Vienna, Austria.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

C. O. Westfall,
766 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified be, and the same is hereby, answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Manly S. Sullivan. 851

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in error, vs. D. J. Alford. 983

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the cause remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Stone & Downer Co. and Lowe, Donald & Co. 150

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Court of Customs Appeals,

in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Court of Customs Appeals, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

See order of October 10, 1927, correcting opinion and modifying judgment.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Thomas Contreras.
15 Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

103 Park Avenue Company,
Plaintiff in error,
579 vs.
Exchange Buffet Corporation, The City of New York, and Charles I. Craig, as Comptroller of the City of New York.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George McNeir,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, with leave to counsel to file a brief as amicus curiae in the case of No. 779, Blodgett vs. Holden, Collector, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday,

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Harry B. Stilz,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of a motion for leave to file in the Court of Claims a petition in the nature of a bill of review, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Desmond, Sheriff of Pierce County, Washington,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
Milo Eggers.

On consideration of a motion for a stay of execution, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Joseph Y. Saunders,
Petitioner,
——, Original.

On consideration of a motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice to the filing of a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the District Court of the United States for the District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank White,
Petitioner,
1091 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. The costs already incurred herein by direction of the Court shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank White,
Petitioner,
1091 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for the reason that the Court upon examination of the unprinted record herein submitted can find no grounds for the issuance of a writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Nancy and Charles Zahn,
Petitioners,
1092 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. The costs already incurred herein by direction of the Court shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Nancy and Charles Zahn,
Petitioners,
1092 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for the reason that the Court upon examination of the unprinted record herein submitted can find no grounds for the issuance of a writ of certiorari.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Willos,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The State of Oregon.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

864

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and ajdudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Real Silk Hosiery Mills,
vs.
City of Piedmont, Oliver Ellsworth, Mayor of the City of Piedmont, G. N. Richardson, City Attorney, etc., et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

313

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that question No. 1, should be, ~~and it is hereby~~ answered in the affirmative, In view of the answer to the first question, the second question needs none.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Sanford.

V. L. Highland,
Petitioner,
vs.
Russell Car & Snow Plow Company.

1015

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
1028 vs.
Barrett Gibson, Administrator.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Levy, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
1029 vs.
Industrial Finance Corporation et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
1031 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. L. Becker and Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
1035 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor, etc.
C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
1036 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor, etc.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. H. Smallwood, W. F. Smallwood, et al., etc., Petitioners,
1018 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.
Adolfo Valdes Ordonez, Salvador Garcia, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1019 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.
Insular Motor Corporation,
Petitioner,
1020 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the for the First Circuit is granted and the cases are set for hearing on the first day of next term, Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on the sole question whether they have become moot by virtue of the act of March 4, 1927, amending section 48 of the organic act of Porto Rico. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adolfo Valdes, Pio Perez, Luis C. Cuyar, Petitioners,
1021 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Finlay, Waymouth & Lee, Inc., Petitioner,
1022 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Angel Abarca Portilla, Rafael Abarca Portilla, et al., etc., Petitioner,
1023 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted and the cases are set for hearing on the first day of next term, Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on the sole question whether they have become moot by virtue of the act of March 4, 1927, amending section 48 of the organic act of Porto Rico. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eaton, Brown & Simpson, Inc., Petitioner,
955 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas Company and the Orange-
Cameron Land Company,
Petitioners,
1013 vs.
Rosenthal-Brown Fur Company, Inc.,
and Charles W. Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. McLaughlin, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Leon M. Prince.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pullman Company,
Petitioner,
1024 vs.
Paul Montimore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beaver County,
Petitioner,
1026 vs.
South Utah Mines & Smelters.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Co.,
Petitioner,
1027 vs.
Gilbert J. Contois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guy K. Mitchell, Executor of Annie W. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
1030 vs.
Norman T. Nelson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Frank I. Louckes, Bankrupt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mabel Ludlam,
Petitioner,
1034 vs.
Leigh Arey Channon, Ex'x. of the Estate of James H. Channon, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dinshah P. Ghadiali,
Petitioner,
1049 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. J. Longest,
Plaintiff in error,
342 vs.
W. C. Langford et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Bowen and Mr. W. F. Semple for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

E. J. Angelo et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
996 vs.
City of Winston-Salem et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy L. Deal for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oscar O. Efrid, Mr. J. M. Wells, Jr., and Mr. G. S. Ferguson, Jr., for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Edward A. McLaughlin, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Leon M. Prince.

The motion for leave to file a certificate of the clerk of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit as to the correctness of the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Stein for the petitioner.

James McDonald, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners,
147 vs.
Lawrence Maxwell et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles V. Imlay in that behalf, the mandate was granted in this cause.

Southern California Edison Company,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus et al.

The motion for an order suspending the injunction and advancing this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Ernst Hudson on behalf of Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, Mr. George E. Trowbridge, Mr. William M. Conley, and Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James F. Peck and Mr. Robert Duncan for the respondents, in opposition thereto.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
1056 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fulton R. Brylawski in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt Paving and Rubber Company.

The motion for an order as to the printing of the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry M. Paul, Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Samuel E. Hibben, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander F. Reichmann, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, and Mr. William F. Hall for the respondent.

Henry Wilson, et al.,
Petitioners,
744 vs.
Pacific Mail Steamship Company et al.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company et al.,
Petitioners,
863 vs.
Henry Wilson, et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. F. R. Shearer in that behalf, It is now here ordered that these cases be consolidated for argument in the time of one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of T. L. Smith,
Petitioner,
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of Mr. A. D. Lipscomb for the petitioner.

Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer,
Appellant,
840 vs.
Santini Fertilizer Company.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Rigby, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Nelson Cammans for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Ex parte:
In the matter of E. L. Burget,
Petitioner,
——.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. E. L. Burget pro se.

E. L. Burget,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
E. B. Cranston et al.

The motion for a change of venue in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. E. L. Burget, pro se.

John R. Osborne et al.,
Petitioners,
1051 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Hannis Taylor, Jr., in behalf of Mr. Maynard F. Stiles for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a reply brief on behalf of the petitioners within ten days from this date.

News Syndicate Company.
1100 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred C. J. Farrell in behalf of Mr. Luther M. Walter for News Syndicate Company.

State of Washington, on the relation of McPherson Bros. Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
1096 vs.
Superior Court of the State of Washington, in and for Douglas County, et al.

State of Washington, on the relation of McPherson Bros. Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
1097 vs.
Superior Court of the State of Washington, in and for Douglas County, et al.

The motions to dismiss these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, in behalf of Mr. John P. Hartman, for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Hudson Coal Company,
Plaintiff in error,
679 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Robert Jones, and Mr. George W. Woodruff for the defendant in error

Ex parte:
In the matter of S. A. Moore, Trustee. Petitioner.
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude L. Smith and Mr. Wells Goody-Koontz for the petitioner.

Wabash Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
748 vs.
South Daviess County Drainage District.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the plaintiff in error, and he having submitted a motion by the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Texas,
Appellant,
749 vs.
David Fasken, A. Fasken, Robert Fasken, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Black for the appellees, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Claude Pollard and Mr. D. A. Simmons for the appellant, in opposition thereto, and upon motion by the appellant to transfer this case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles L. Black for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Anna E. Holloway Nones, Individually and as Executrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
903 vs.
Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, et al., etc.
Anna E. Holloway Nones, Individually and as Executrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
904 vs.
Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, et al., etc.
Clarence J. Holloway,
Plaintiff in error,
905 vs.
Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, et al., etc.
Clarence J. Holloway,
Plaintiff in error,
906 vs.
Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, et al., etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac Lobe Straus, Mr. Joseph C. France, Mr. J. Paul Schmidt, and Mr. Charles McHenry Howard for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. P. Keech, Jr., and Mr. Edgar Allan Poe for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

United Railways Company of St. Louis and Rolla Wells, Receiver of United Railways Company of St. Louis,
Appellants,
1009 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri, T. J. Brown, Almon Ing, D. F. Calfee, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. S. E. Francis for the appellants and he having submitted a motion by the appellants and a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion and stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Broadway Trust Company, Trustee,
Appellant,
1017 vs.
William L. Dill, Receiver of Hanover Farms Company.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl A. Feick for the appellee, in support of the motion.

Burke and James, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1072 vs.
The United States.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. C. C. Carlin and Mr. M. Carter Hall for the petitioners, and they having submitted a motion of the petitioner to dismiss its pdition for a writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred M. Butzel, guardian ad litem of Agnes Salloum,
Plaintiff in error,
890 vs.
Anna Schneller and Robert M. Toms, Prosecuting Attorney of the County of Wayne.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Long for the plaintiff in error, and he having submitted a motion of the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in the cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Frish and Edward Frish,
Petitioners,
1032 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Irene Rutherford O'Crowley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mrs. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

John F. Milliken and Neptune Association, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
1033 vs.
Harlan F. Stone, United States Attorney General, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Axtell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Lucius H. Beers, and Mr. Allen Evarts Foster for the respondents.

Aaron Brumright, Trustee, et al.,
Petitioners,
1037 vs.
Texas Sugarland Company and Grand Lodge Ancient Order of United Workmen of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. Hill, Jr., for the petitioners.

Raymond L. Chase,
Petitioner,
1039 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Louise Foster for the respondent.

Robert C. Whitney,
Petitioner,
1040 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Ridley Watts, Charles H. Murphy, Arthur R. Johnson, et al., partners, etc., Petitioners,
1041 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Stevenson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Clark, Mr. F. G. Tompkins, and Mr. S. R. Prince for the respondent.

Empire Coal Mining Company,
Petitioner,
1042 vs.
Godfrey Updike, as Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter and Mr. Charles D. Francis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank M. Swacker and Mr. Isadore Shapiro for the respondent.

B. Frank Wood and J. Leigh Hourse,
Petitioners,
1043 vs.
Henry Cooper, United States Marshal, etc.
B. Frank Wood,
Petitioner,
1044 vs.
Henry Cooper, United States Marshal, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Gore, Mr. James A. Reed, and Mr. Thomas H. Owen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Clara M. Pittman and William T. Pittman, Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The Lamar Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander W. Spence for the petitioners.

John Pattis, Petitioners,
1046 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. Coffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mrs. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

Cornell Steamboat Company, Petitioner,
1047 vs.
John J. Coughlin et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Erskine and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey, Mr. Mark Ash, Mr. Horace L. Cheyney, and Mr. P. M. Brown for the respondents.

Chattanooga Savings Bank, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
1048 vs.
L. P. Brewer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Caffey and Mr. P. B. Mayfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

John R. Osborne and C. C. Fitz-Patrick, Petitioners,
1051 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maynard F. Stiles for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Creek Nation, Petitioner,
1052 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. George E. Chamberlain, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, and Mr. E. J. Van Court for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George T. Stormont for the respondent.

Henry L. Schwartz, Petitioner,
1053 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Susan Brandeis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Percy A. Clarey, Petitioner,
1054 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy A. Clarey, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Frederich der Grosse,"
Petitioner,
1055 vs.
The Texas Company, Owner of the Steamship "Texas".

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. George R. Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. K. Schmuck for the respondent.

Thomas F. Barrett,
Petitioner,
1057 vs.
F. Brady Bigger, Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McNeill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

M. C. Danciger and Emerich Oil Company, Petitioners,
1060 vs.
N. K. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Boatright and Mr. I. J. Ringolsky for the petitioners.

Charles Vere,
Petitioner,
1061 vs.
Francisco Bianchi et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Travieso for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the respondents.

U. T. Hungerford Brass & Company, Petitioner,
1062 vs.
The Traitel Marble Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert W. Hardie for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1063 vs.
Birdie Steen, Administratrix of the Estate of C. L. Steen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank W. Wozencraft, Mr. Joseph D. Frank, and Mr. W. T. Henry for the petitioner, and by Mr. James M. Edwards and Mr. Fred V. Hughes for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
1064 vs.
New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, as Owner of the Steamship "Esperanza".
The United States of America, as Owner of the Torpedo Boat Destroyer "Conner," Petitioner,
1065 vs.
Steamship "Esperanza," etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. George H. Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Eugene Underwood for the respondents.

O. D. Jennings & Company, Petitioner,
1066 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Jennings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

H. Plamals,
Petitioner,
1067 vs.
The Steamship "Pinar Del Rio," her engines, boilers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Axtell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating and Mr. Vernon S. Jones for the respondent.

Wallace B. Camp,
Petitioner,
1070 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin D. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Rosario Gambino and Joseph Lima,
Petitioners,
1071 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Fred Ostrander,
Petitioner,
1073 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Cora B. Beatty, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of John W. Beatty, deceased, Petitioner,
1074 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Stewart, Mr. Earl F. Reed, and Mr. W. A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. T. H. Lewis for the respondent.

Ben B. Lindsey, Petitioner,
1076 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado upon the complaint of Royal R. Graham and Charles L. Laney, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Huston Thompson, Mr. James A. Marsh, Mr. Thomas Ward, Jr., and Mr. Horace Hawkins for the petitioner, and by Mary F. Lathrop for the respondents.

John MacGregor Grant, Inc., Petitioner,
1078 vs.
Boris Topas, Anskei Maftanovitch, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard Hershkopf, Mr. Isidor J. Kresel, and Mr. John Proctor Clarke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice Leon and Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., for the respondent.

Everett Flint Damon, ex rel. Kook Tang et al., Petitioners,
1080 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Flint Damon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, May 31 next, at

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that William H. Douglass, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. J. Neale, It is ordered that John T. Sullivan, Esquire, of Waterloo, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert J. Dunaher, It is ordered that Oliver B. James, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, It is ordered that George Gray Zabriskie, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Bolitha J. Laws, It is ordered that Talma L. Smith, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Alexander, It is ordered that Patrick J. Flannery, and Daniel F. Hickey, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison, It is ordered that Elmer L. Beach and Wm. P. Bartel, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas B. Shoemaker, It is ordered that Harold H. Simms, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, It is ordered that Philip E. Siggers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Ed. M. Hooper, Esquire, of Oshkosh, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd H. Sutton, It is ordered that Lewis A. Wright, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Watts T. Estabrook, It is ordered that Arthur J. Hudson, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Ferris D. Stone and William J. Shaw, Esquires, of Detroit Michigan, and J. Whitla Stinson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry K. Hickey, It is ordered that R. H. Porter, Esquire, of Delray, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Portneuf Marsh Valley Canal Company, Petitioner, vs. Howard W. Brown and John R. Chapin, Trustees. 252

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Independent Coal and Coke Company
and Carbon County Land Company,
Petitioners,
300 vs.
The United States of America and
Carbon County.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed ant that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Butler.

Fox River Paper Company, Patten
Paper Company, Limited, Appleton
Woolen Mills, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
492 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

215 vs.

Eastman Kodak Company, George Eastman, Jules E. Brulatour, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Company,

Plaintiff in error,

214 vs.

The United States of America.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

James Stewart & Company,

Plaintiff in error,

290 vs.

Dominick Rivera.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the

same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

S. M. Gorieb,
Petitioner,
799 vs.
Charles D. Fox, et al., Members of the City Council of Roanoke, Virginia, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Benjamin H. Clark and Charles Riggs, a partnership doing business under the firm name of Clark and Riggs, Appellants,
275 vs.
George T. Poor, C. C. Marshall and Frank B. Maullar, constituting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
James M. Lee, alias James M. Leach.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
709 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining Company, Westmoreland Coal Company, New River & Pocahontas Consolidated Coal Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, and
the Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
710 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company, Bethlehem
Mines Corporation, Bethlehem Steel
Corporation, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
711 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company, Seaboard
By-Product Coke Company, Chicago
By-Product Coke Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
712 vs.
Public Service Electric & Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Pocahontas Operators' Association,
Empire Coal & Coke Company, and
Pocahontas Fuel Company,
Appellants,
713 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining Company,
Westmoreland Coal Company, New
River & Pocahontas Consolidated
Coal Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Pocahontas Operators' Association,
Empire Coal & Coke Company and
Pocahontas Fuel Company,
Appellants,
714 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company, Bethlehem Mines Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Pocahontas Operators' Association,
Empire Coal & Coke Company, and
Pocahontas Fuel Company,
Appellants,
715 vs.
Rainey-Wood Coke Company, Seaboard By-Product Coke Company, Chicago By-Product Coke Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Pocahontas Operators' Association
Empire Coal & Coke Company and
Pocahontas Fuel Company,
Appellants,
716 vs.
Public Service Electric & Gas
Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
606 vs.
The Akron, Canton & Youngstown
Railway, Atlanta & West Point
Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Pocahontas Operators' Association,
Empire Coal & Coke Company, and
Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.,
Appellants,
638 vs.
The Akron, Canton & Youngstown
Railway, Atlanta & West Point
Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

J. F. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor,
Edwin Dabney, Attorney General,
etc., et al., Appellants,
894 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway
Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Arkansas Railroad Commission and
W. H. Donham, as Prosecuting
Attorney, etc.,
Appellants,
549 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific
Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Malcolm E. Nichols, Collector of
Internal Revenue of the United
States for the District of
Massachusetts,
Plaintiff in error,
88 vs.
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P.
Loring, Executors of the will of
Julia Coolidge.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
279 vs.
American Tobacco Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

U. Sherman Joines,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
William M. Patterson, Doroth A. McFarland, nee Patterson, Shelby A. Patterson, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

State of New York,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion of the defendants to strike out Paragraph III of the Bill of Complaint herein; It is ordered that said Paragraph be stricken out, without prejudice to the right of the plaintiff State, if later on in a position to do so, to litigate the questions which the said paragraph is intended to present.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Power Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Harvey Saunders. 258

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

C. J. Longest, Plaintiff in error, vs. W. C. Langford and G. N. Puckett. 342

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as improvidently allowed,

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

C. J. Longest, Petitioner, vs. W. C. Langford and G. N. Puckett. 342

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Arthur Maul,
Petitioner,
655 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
267 vs.
Freights, Sub-Freights, Charter Hire and/or Sub-Charter Hire of the S.S. "Mount Shasta".

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Empire Trust Company,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Charles Hazlitt Cahan.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Thomas B. White, as Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas,
771 vs.
Vuco Perovich.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative. This renders the other questions certified immaterial.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue, Ben F. Wright as Insular Auditor, Vincent Carmona, etc., et al., Petitioners,
363 vs.
The City of Manila.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Overland Motor Company,
285 vs.
Packard Motor Car Company and Wire Wheel Corporation of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert L. Messel,
Petitioner,
202 vs.
Foundation Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Rhea,
Petitioner,
199 vs.
Thomas C. Smith.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Foster Cline, as District Attorney for the City and County of Denver, State of Colorado,
Appellant,
304 vs.
Frink Dairy Company, The Windsor Farm Dairy Company, and The Climax Dairy Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part, and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
In the Matter of T. L. Smith,
Petitioner.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of S. A. Moore,
Trustee, Petitioner,
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition herein, It is now here ordered, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of E. L. Burget,
Petitioner,
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. L. Burget,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
E. B. Cranston, et al.

On consideration of the motion for a change of venue in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
Wright Thornburgh, an incompetent, by M. F. Moroney, his guardian, et al.

On consideration of the motion to dispense with the printing of the record in this case on petition for certiorari, It is now here ordered that the abstract and designation filed by counsel shall be printed in lieu of the complete record for the consideration of the application for certiorari in this case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hudson Coal Company,
Plaintiff in error,
679 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix of Edward D. Untermyer, as Executor of the last will and testament of Isaac Untermyer, deceased,
Petitioner,
1056 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States of America for the Third District of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, with leave to counsel, however, to file brief as amicus curiae in the case of Blodgett v. Holden, Collector, No. 779, heretofore assigned for Monday, October 3d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

News Syndicate Company,
1100 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Texas,

Appellant,

749 vs.

David Fasken, A. Fasken, Robert Fasken, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Texas,

Appellant,

749 vs.

David Fasken, A. Fasken, Robert Fasken, et al.

On consideration of the motion of the appellant to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. The motion of the appellant in the alternative, to docket the case as an original cause, is denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna E. Holloway Nones, Individually and as Executrix of Edward Lee Holloway, deceased,

Plaintiff in error,

903 vs.

Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, and Marie Calou, guardian of the person and estate of Grace Suzanne Holloway, infant, et al.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna E. Holloway Nones, Individually
and as Executrix of Edward Lee
Holloway, deceased,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Apppeals

904 vs. of the State of Maryland.

Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, and
Marie Calou, Guardian of the person
and estate of Grace Suzanne Holloway,
infant, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence J. Holloway,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Appeals

905 vs. of the State of Maryland.

Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant,
and Marie Calou, Guardian of the
person and estate of Grace Suzanne
Holloway, Infant, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence J. Holloway,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Appeals

906 vs. of the State of Maryland.

Grace Suzanne Holloway, Infant, and
Marie Calou, Guardian of the person
and estate of Grace Suzanne Holloway,
Infant, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. J. Angelo, Harry Phillips, and C. E. Wall, trading, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. City of Winston-Salem, Thos. Barber, Mayor of the City of Winston-Salem, and J. A. Thomas, etc.

996 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Washington on the relation of McPherson Bros. Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Superior Court of the State of Washington, etc., et al.

1096

State of Washington on the relation of McPherson Bros. Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. Superior Court of the State of Washington, etc., et al.

1097

Upon consideration of the motions to dismiss the writs of error in these causes, It is now here ordered that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, passed for consideration on June 6th next, in order that the time in which such motions, under the rules, could properly be submitted, shall have elapsed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer, Appellant,
840 vs.
Santini Fertilizer Company.

Upon consideration of the motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. It is now here ordered that the consideration of the motion be postponed, and the case is set for hearing on the first day of the next term, Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on the sole question whether they have become moot by virtue of the act of March 4, 1927, amending section 48 of the organic act of Porto Rico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Edison Company, Petitioner,
948 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus, Bertha Genevieve Bottoms, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Edison Company, Petitioner,
948 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus, Bertha Genevieve Bottoms, etc., et al.

Upon consideration of the motion to suspend the injunction issued by the Supreme Court of the State of California in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. McLaughlin, Trustee, Petitioner,
1014 vs.
Leon M. Prince.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a certificate of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals of the First Circuit as to the correctness of the record in this case; It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, as the application for a writ of certiorari herein has been heretofore denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
1028 vs.
Barrett Gibson, Administrator.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here-by denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
1028 vs.
Barrett Gibson, Administrator.

Upon consideration of the brief filed by the respondent herein, the writ of certiorari heretofore issued in this cause is revoked.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. O. Danciger and Emerich Oil Company, Petitioners,
1060 vs.
N. K. Smith.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Plamals, Petitioner,
1067 vs.
The Steamship "Pinar Del Rio", her engines, boilers, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rosario Gambino and Joseph Lima,
Petitioners,
1071 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cora B. Beatty, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of John W. Beatty, deceased,
Petitioner,
1074 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue of the twenty-third District of the United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration of decision of the application for a writ of certiorari in this case.

Thompson-Starrett Company,
Petitioner,
1025 vs.
La Belle Iron Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Frish and Edward Frish,
Petitioners,
1032 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Milliken and Neptune Association of Masters and Mates of Ocean and Coastwise Steam Vessels, Inc., and Alex. Smith,
Petitioners,
1033 vs.
Harlan F. Stone, United States Attorney General, William Hayward, U. S. Attorney, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aaron Drumright, Trustee, R. T. Stuart and R. T. Stuart & Company,
Petitioners,
1037 vs.
Texas Sugarland Company and Grand Lodge Ancient Order of United Workmen of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond L. Chase,
Petitioner,
1039 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert C. Whitney,
Petitioner,
1040 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ridley Watts, Charles H. Murphy, Arthur H. Johnson, et al., partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
1041 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Coal Mining Company,

Petitioner,

1042 vs.

Godfrey Updike, as Receiver and Trustee of the Estate of the Independent Coal Corporation, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Frank Wood and J. Leigh Nourse,

Petitioners,

1043 vs.

Henry Cooper, United States Marshal in and for the Eastern District of Oklahoma and the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Frank Wood,

Petitioner,

1044 vs.

Henry Cooper, United States Marshal in and for the Eastern District of Oklahoma and the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clara M. Pittman, and William T. Pittman,
Petitioners,
1045 vs.
The Lamar Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Pattis,
Petitioner,
1046 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
1047 vs.
John J. Coughlin and J. C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chattanooga Savings Bank, Administrator of the Estate of John D. Key, deceased, Petitioner, vs. L. P. Brewer, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the District of Tennessee. 1048

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John R. Osborne and C. C. Fitz-Patrick, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 1051

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Creek Nation, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 1052

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry L. Schwartz,
Petitioner,
1053 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Percy A. Clarey,
Petitioner,
1054 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Frederich Der Grosse",
Petitioner,
1055 vs.
The Texas Company, Owner of the Steamship "Texas".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas F. Barrett,
Petitioner,
1057 vs.
J. Brady Bigger, Agent of the State of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Vare,
Petitioner,
1061 vs.
Francisco Bianchi, Juan Bianchi, Rosario Bianchi, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. T. Hungerford Brass & Copper Company, Petitioner,
1062 vs.
The Traitel Marble Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
1063 vs.
Birdie Steen, Administratrix of the Estate of C. L. Steen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1064 vs.
New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, as Owner of the Steamship "Esperanza".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, as Owner of the Torpedo Boat Destroyer "Conner".
Petitioner,
1065 vs.
Steamship "Esperanza"., etc., New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

O. D. Jennings & Company,
Petitioner,
1066 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, as Collector of Internal Revenue, at Chicago, Illinois, for the First District of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace B. Camp,
Petitioner,
1070 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Ostrander,
Petitioner,
1073 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John MacGregor Grant, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1078 vs.
Boris Topas, Anakei Naftanovitch, Mechail Topas, et al., copartners, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett Flint Demon, ex rel. Kook Tang, et al., Petitioners,
1080 vs.
John P. Johnson, Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Idaho.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Attorney General Sargent for the complainant.

A. W. Duckett & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
557 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the respondent, and he having confessed error in respect of the failure to allow interest, on the authority of Phelps, Surviving Partner, etc., vs. United States, No. 531, decided May 16, 1927, and moved the Court to reverse the amended judgment of the Court of Claims and remand the cause to that court for further proceedings,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the amended judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed;

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. E. Taylor,
Plaintiff in error,
884 vs.
L. F. DeHart et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error, in support of the motion.

F. H. Mason,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

L. M. Willcutts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
791 vs.
Milton Dairy Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 801 vs. W. A. MacFarland, et al., copartners, etc.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
W. C. Tucker, Petitioner, 850 vs. Acel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the respondent.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 869 vs. Ole Berkeness,	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Keifer for the petitioner.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 1016 vs. Oesterlein Machine Company.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. A. W. Gregg for the petitioner.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner, 1035 vs. The Colonial Trust Company, Executor, etc., C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner, 1036 vs. The Colonial Trust Company, Executor, etc.	The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. W. A. Gregg, for the petitioner.

Brimstone Railroad and Canal Company, Appellant,
1108 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondents.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia,
Petitioner,
1031 vs.
James A. Baer, Trustee In Bankruptcy, etc.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Johnston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harvey B. Apperson for the respondent.

J. Mell Brooks et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
499 vs.
D. H. Blackwood, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas.

Upon consideration of the motion to revive this cause in the name of Ralph Koonce, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas, and that the cause be continued and maintained against the said Ralph Koonce, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Apex Electric Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph E. Moody for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and Sheffield Car Company,
Petitioners,
——, Original.

The motion for leave to fiel a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dwight B. Cheever and Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioners.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
653 vs.
The State of Florida, ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., etc.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
654 vs.
The State of Florida, ex rel. R. Hudson Burr et al., etc.

The joint motion to advance this cause to be heard immediately following cases Nos. 872 and 873, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell and Mr. Fred H. Davis for the respondents, with the consent of Mr. James F. Wright, Mr. William Kay, Mr. Thomas B. Adams, Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey, and Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioners.

Western Maryland Dairy Company,
Plaintiff in error,
962 vs.
Harold E. West, Ezra B. Whitman, J. Frank Harper, comprising and constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland, et al., etc.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. William L. Rawls, and he having filed a motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Broadway Trust Company, Trustee,
Appellant,
1017 vs.
William L. Dill, Receiver of Hanover Farms Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the appeal herein has been filed,

Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taf

James A. Cardigan,
Petitioner,
1145 vs.
Thomas B. White, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Cardigan, pro se.

John Carlton Dysart,
Petitioner,
1151 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Carlton Dysart, pro se.

The United States ex rel. Joseph Y. Saunders,
Petitioner,
1154 vs.
Hon. Walter I. McCoy, Chief Justice, Supreme Court, District of Columbia.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Y. Saunders, pro se.

New York & Pennsylvania Railway Company, by Howard Cobb et al., Assignees,
Petitioners,
1000 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Riley H. Heath for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

The New York Trust Company,
Petitioner,
1050 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Unger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Hammond Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Oscar Sandin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold M. Sawyer for the petitioner.

William V. Dwyer and Edward C. Cohron, Petitioners,
1075 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Burkan and Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

National Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
1077 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Moorfield Storey, and Mr. George B. Young for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
1079 vs.
City of Norfolk, R. W. Peatross, A. Plummer Pannill, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Tunstall and Mr. Nathaniel T. Green for the petitioner.

Henry Ellison, William R. Ellison et al., Petitioners,
1081 vs.
Max Koswig, trading as P. P. Koswig.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of ~~Appeals of~~ the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Edgar Barnes for the petitioners.

Succession Francisca de los Reyes Correa et al., Petitioners,
1082 vs.
William P. Kramer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by ' .

Francisca R. Correa pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. William C. Rigby for the respondent.

The Southern Sierras Power Company, Petitioner,
1083 vs.
Arizona Edison Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Chalmers and Mr. Thomas G. Nairn for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Mason Ross and Mr. Everett E. Ellinwood for the respondent.

Charles A. McEuen, Petitioner,
1084 vs.
The City of Newark, Hugh F. Cook, Margaret Cook, et al., etc.
Charles A. McEuen, Petitioner,
1085 vs.
Hugh F. Cook, Margaret Cook, Paul Burne, et al., etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cecil H. MacMahon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the respondents.

E. M. Jeggle,
Petitioner,
1086 vs.
Fred Mansur, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hudson P. Hibbard and Mr. Louis Kleindienst for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred Mansur and Mr. Byron C. Hanna for the respondent.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1087 vs.
Northside Belt Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Garwood and Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioner.

Hidalgo County Water Improvement District Number Five,
Petitioner,
1089 vs.
Western Metal Manufacturing Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don A. Bliss for the petitioner.

Leonard Van Norden,
Petitioner,
1093 vs.
Chas. R. McCormick Lumber Company of Delaware.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the petitioner.

American Wholesale Corporation,
Petitioner,
1094 vs.
Stephen Stone, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Julius Levy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence A. Fry for the respondent.

C. C. Steen and Edward R. Holmes et al., etc. Petitioners,
1095 vs.
Viola Le Flore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey, Mr. Streeter B. Flynn, and Mr. A. A. McDonald for the petitioners.

Morris Druin, Petitioner,
1099 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph J. Kelly, Mr. Joseph J. Weinberger, and Mr. Harry H. Weinberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Vincent Barnitt for the respondent.

United Dredging Company of New Jersey and Southern Casualty Company of Louisiana, Petitioners,
1102 vs.
Carl Lindberg and Lawson Lindberg, by their next friend and mother, Mrs. C. Lindberg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brantly Harris and Mr. Maco Stewart for the petitioners.

Myra L. Garland, Petitioner.
1105.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Probate of the State of Maine was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey D. Eaton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward F. Merrill for the respondent.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
1106 vs.
Valeere Fountain, Administratrix of Estate of Flex Fountain, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch, Mr. H. D. Minor, Mr. R. H. Thompson, Mr. R. L. Dent, Mr. S. L. McLaurin, and Mr. C. H. McKay for the petitioners.

Commercial Union Fire Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
1109 vs.
G. L. Marshall et al.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
1110 vs.
G. L. Marshall et al.
Home Fire and Marine Insurance Company of California,
Petitioner,
1111 vs.
G. L. Marshall et al.
Commercial Union Assurance Company of London, Petitioner,
1112 vs.
G. L. Marshall et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Lee Bartels for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thos. A. Evans for the respondents.

Jesse C. Adkins, Hugh B. Rowland, Roger B. Whiteford, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1114 vs.
Ignatius J. Costigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, Mr. Roger B. Whiteford, Mr. M. M. Doyle, and Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the petitioners, and by Mr. George P. Hoover and Mr. Morgan H. Beach for the respondent.

J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co.,
Petitioner,
1115 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter E. Hampton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence, and Mr. Marion De Vries for the respondent.

Broadway Trust Company, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1116 vs.
William L. Dill, Receiver of
Hanover Farms Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey F. Carr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carl A. Feick for the respondent.

Union Petroleum Steamship Company,
as Owner of the S.S. "Westwego",
Petitioner,
1120 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Petitioner,
1126 vs.
A. C. Lawrence Leather Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph P. Nolan for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the respondent.

B. K. Gorse, Trustee of the Estate of J. L. Walker, Bankrupt, Petitioner, 1130 vs. W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee of the Estate of Walker Grain Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. C. Rowe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.
Arthur M. Abell, Temporary Administrator of the Estate of Adeline S. Abell, Petitioner, 1137 vs. Flora B. Thompson and George W. White, Executors, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Frailey for the petitioner.
B. Frank Wood and J. Leigh Nourse, Petitioner, 1139 vs. The United States of America. B. Frank Wood, Petitioner, 1140 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. P. Gore, Mr. James A. Reed, and Mr. Thos. H. Owen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
Colastie Andrus, joined pro forma by her husband, Sidney Andrus, et al., Petitioners, 1142 vs. F. M. Hutchinson et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. D. Gordon for the petitioners.

Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and Sheffield Car Company, Petitioners,
1143 vs.
American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dwight B. Cheever and Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the respondents.

Marcelle Smith, Petitioner,
1150 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neal E. McNeill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company, Petitioner,
969 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

Upon consideration of the motions of counsel designating portions of the record to be printed in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and they are hereby, granted, and the Clerk is directed to print the record in this case in accordance with the said designations.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Cecil S. Ackerson, Esquire, of Keyport, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Selby, It is ordered that Kenelm L. Shirk, Harold G. Ripple, Robert Ruppin, Harry L. Raub, Jr., and J. Andrew Frantz, Esquires, of Lancaster, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that J. Louis Monarch, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, and Fred Herrigel, Jr., Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Harry S. Hartstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. Chantland, It is ordered that Sol A. Herzog, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that Rodowe H. Abeken, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter E. Barton, It is ordered that C. W. Browing, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Albert G. Redpath, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Louis Kranitz, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Irvine L. Lenroot, Esquire, of Superior, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Benjamin Wham, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. F. Garvey, It is ordered that William Evans, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Barse, It is ordered that James C. Wilkes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Thomas G. Prioleau, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Meriweather Smith, It is ordered that R. V. Perez Marchand, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Lester Moore, It is ordered that Emma Bryan Breen, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Hall, It is ordered that Alfred J. O'Brien, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Henry White, It is ordered that Paul Maynard, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene S. Mason, It is ordered that Herbert H. Porter, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. R. Bell, It is ordered that Ernest A. Landman, Esquire, of Athens, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters,Jr.. It is ordered that William C. Martin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis A. Dent, It is ordered that Stanley Suydam, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"The Court announces with deep personal sorrow the death of William Riley Stansbury, its Clerk, at 5 o'clock on yesterday (Sunday) morning, June 5.

"Mr. Stansbury was born May 25, 1856, so that he had reached the age of 71. He was born, and has always lived, in this District, except for a year or two spent in the Signal Service of the United States. He entered this Court as an assistant clerk in August, 1882, and has acted in every capacity as a subordinate in the clerk's office, having succeeded Mr. James D. Maher as clerk in October, 1921, six years ago. He was an accurate, faithful, earnest, and efficient public servant. He was saturated with the traditions of the office and familiar to the last detail with all the duties to be discharged in that important place. He endeared himself in every relation to the members of the Court. He was genial and accommodating and interested for every member of the public, and especially every one of the bar who had to transact business with the Court. He was a man of the utmost probity and of highest character in every respect.

"The Court takes great pride in the history of the maintenance of the traditions of the clerk's office and of the length of service of those who administered it. Mr. Bayard was appointed clerk in 1791 and served until 1800. Mr. Caldwell was appointed in 1800 and served until 1825. Mr. Carroll was appointed in 1827 and served until 1863. Mr. Middleton was appointed in 1863 and served until 1880. Mr. James H. McKenney was appointed in 1880, having been for years the chief assistant of Mr. Middleton, and served until 1913. Mr. James D. Maher, having for may years since boyhood been an assistant in the clerk's office, was appointed clerk in 1913 and served until 1921. Mr. Stansbury having been appointed assistant clerk in 1882, and having served as the head of the office for six years, looked back to a record of forty-five years. Such lengths of service indicate not only fidelity but efficiency, for only by reason of the latter could the incumbents have continued during the term they served.

"Because the Court adjourns this morning for the term of 1926, and for more than three months, and because no successor to Mr. Stansbury could be appointed during the vacation, it has been necessary for the Court, in spite of Mr. Stansbury's very recent death, to appoint his successor, in order that the successor may be installed, give his bonds, and begin the administration of his office, which, because of its public obligations, can not be suspended at all.

"Mr. Philander Riley Stansbury, the brother of the late Clerk, has been an assistant for more than 30 years and has rendered faithful services. Because of the state of his health he has declined to be considered for the succession.

"The Court has appointed as its Clerk, to succeed Mr. Stansbury, Charles Elmore Cropley, of Washington. Mr. Cropley has already served in the Court as Page and Assistant some 18 years, but is still in the prime of life. He has great familiarity with the duties of the office and carries with him to its headship the traditions that have secured such distinguished and useful service by Mr. Stansbury and his predecessors, with the probability of a life of long usefulness.

"The members of the court will attend the funeral of Mr. Stansbury in a body, at half past 10 to-morrow (Tuesday) morning, at St. Andrews Episcopal Church, at the corner of Fifteenth and V Streets."

ORDER

It is hereby ordered that Charles Elmore Cropley be appointed Clerk of this Court in the place of William R. Stansbury, deceased, and that he forthwith take the oath of office and give bond conditioned according to law.

Which said oath and bonds are in the following words and figures, viz:

"I, CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, being appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully enter and record all the orders , decrees, judgments and proceedings of the said Court and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties of my said office, according to the best of my abilities and understanding. So help me God.

(signed) CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 6th day of June, A. D. 1927.

(signed) WM. H. TAFT,

Chief Justice of the United States."

"KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

That we, CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, as principal, and THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY, Hartford, Connecticut, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($20,000.00) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States of America or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 6th of June, A. D. 1927.

WHEREAS, the above bounden CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States,

NOW THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if he, the said CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States, then this obligation to be void, otherwise, to remain in full force and virtue in law.

(signed) CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, (L.S.)

Signed, sealed and delivered
in the presence of:
(signed) REYNOLDS ROBERTSON
(signed) R. deB. WAGGAMAN

THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY
By (signed) F. D. COMPTON
Attorney-in-fact.

Approved June 6th, 1927, by order of the Court.
(signed) WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the United States."

"KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENT,

That we, CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, as principal, and THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY, Hartford, Connecticut, as surety, are held and firmly bound, for the period of three years beginning with the execution hereof, unto the United States of America, for the benefit of the litigants in the Supreme Court of the United States and of all others, as their interests may appear, in the penal sum of ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($100,000) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States for the benefit of the said litigants and of all others, as their interests may appear, for which payments, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals, and dated this 6th day of June, 1927.

NOW THEREFORE, the condition of this bond is such that if the said CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, Clerk as aforesaid, shall well and truly perform the services for which moneys by law or under the rules of the Court are advanced or paid to him, and shall truly and faithfully account for such moneys thus advanced or paid, and for any excess thereof after the services are rendered, and also for all other moneys received by him as such Clerk, in accordance with law or the orders of this Court, then this obligation to be void; otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

(signed) CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY, (L.S.)

Witnesses:-

(signed) REYNOLDS ROBERTSON

(signed) R. deB WAGGAMAN

THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY

By:- (signed) F. D. COMPTON

Attorney-in-fact.

Approved June 6th, 1927, by order of the Court.

(signed) WM. H. TAFT,

Chief Justice of the United States."

ORDER

ORDERED that the bond for $100,000, additional to his official bond required of the Clerk by order of the Court dated June 6th, 1927, and duly executed by him and the Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, on June 6th, 1927, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be deposited with the Attorney General for safe keeping.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced an order as to the Clerk's bond, which said order is in the words and figures following, viz.:

ORDERED THAT:

1. In addition to his official bond now required of him by law, the Clerk shall furnish, for the benefit of parties litigant in this Court who have deposited amounts to cover costs and fees, a bond, in such amount and with such surety or sureties as shall be approved by the Chief Justice, conditioned to secure the proper performance by the Clerk of the services, to compensate which, such deposits were made, and a true and faithful accounting by him of any excess which may be due them out of such deposits after such costs and fees have been earned and paid, and also of any other moneys received by him as Clerk, according to law or the orders of the Court.

2. Interest on the bank deposits of the Clerk accruing from moneys thus paid him by litigants shall be kept by the Clerk as a separate fund, out of which he shall pay, first, the reasonable cost to him, if any, of the bond above described, and, second, the cost of annual or special audits, directed by the Chief Justice, of the receipt, disbursement, or disposition

of all moneys deposited with him by litigants as aforesaid. Upon order of the Court, whatever shall remain of said separate fund shall be used to make up any deficits arising from a failure of the costs and fees to meet the expenses of the Clerk's office and to pay his own compensation provided by law.

3. After the costs and fees in cases have been earned and paid and the cases closed, any excess of such deposits with the Clerk shall be transferred by him to a special fund in some responsible bank or trust company, there to remain until such moneys shall be claimed by, and paid to, the parties entitled, or shall be otherwise disposed of by order of the Court or by law.

4. The increment of interest earned on the fund described in Paragraph 3 shall, upon order of the Court, be used for the same purposes as those enumerated in Paragraph 2.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

ORDERED that the fees paid to the Clerk by attorneys for admission to the bar of the Court, which are not included in the costs, fees and emoluments of which, under the Acts of March 3, 1883, 22 Statutes, 631, and Section 8 of the Act of March 15, 1898, 30 Statutes, 317, the Clerk is required to make return to the Attorney General, shall, over and above $3,000, in any one year be kept as a fund to be expended under the order of the Court, first, for the reimbursement of the Clerk for any costs, and fees in litigated cases, in which the parties, or either of them, are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; second, to reimburse the Clerk for any deficit which may arise in the running of his office, including his personal compensation under the Act of March 3, 1883, as aforesaid; and, third, for any other purpose deemed proper and ordered by the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

On the application of the Clerk, pursuant to Section 221 of the Judicial Code, it is ordered that Reginald C. Dilli be, and he is hereby, appointed a Deputy Clerk of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

OATH

"I, REGINALD C. DILLI, being appointed a Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully enter and record all the orders, decrees, judgments and proceedings of the said Court, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties of my said office, according to the best of my abilities and understanding. So help me God.

(signed) REGINALD C. DILLI.

Sworn and subscribed to before me
this 6th day of June, A. D. 1927.

(signed) WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the United States."

ORDER

It is now here ordered by this Court that the office of the Clerk of this Court shall be closed one half day on Saturdays from June 15th to September 15th, providing however, that some representative of the Clerk shall remain in the office during the afternoons of such half days in order to receive any filing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
254 vs.
International Harvester Company,
International Harvester Company
of America, International Flax
Twine Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Edward C. Twist,

Petitioner,

301 vs.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ~~Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma~~ for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Edward C. Twist, Albert T. Twist, Jessie L. Payne, nee Twist,

Petitioners,

302 vs.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, inthis cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, ~~Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma,~~ for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the
Town of Vidalia,
Appellants,
140 vs.
Louisa McNeely, Adm'x. of the Estate
of S. B. McNeely, deceased.

Louisa McNeely, Adm'x. of the Estate
of S. B. McNeely, deceased,
Appellant,
163 vs.
Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the
Town of Vidalia.

Appeal and Cross Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Luther Weedin, Commissioner of
Immigration at the Port of Seattle,
Washington, Petitioner,
237 vs.
Chin Bow.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
—, Original.
The State of Idaho.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file bill of complaint, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted: And it is further ordered that process issue herein returnable on Monday, October 3, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Apex Electric Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application for a writ of mandamus to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and Sheffield Car Company,
Petitioners,
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Cardigan,
Petitioner,
1145 vs.
Thomas B. White, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, at Leavenworth, Kansas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Cardigan,
Petitioner,
1145 vs.
Thomas B. White, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, at Leavenworth, Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Carlton Dysart,
Petitioner,
1151 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Carlton Dysart,
Petitioner,
1151 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Joseph Y. Saunders,
Petitioner,
1154 vs.
Hon. Walter I. McCoy, Chief Justice, Supreme Court, District of Columbia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Joseph Y. Saunders,
Petitioner,
1154 vs.
Hon. Walter I. McCoy, Chief Justice, Supreme Court, District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Hicks,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The United States of America.

Upon consideration of the motion of the petitioner to a point counsel to represent him in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Hicks,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The United States of America.

Upon consideration of the motion of the petitioner for leave to withdraw the original record in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to application for use of original record upon showing cause of proper need therefor, same to be forwarded by the Clerk of this Court to the responsible Clerk of the Court where the record is desired for use.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. E. Taylor,
Plaintiff in error,
884 vs.
L. F. DeHart, J. C. Vaughan, and M. C. Wilcox.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the ~~judgment of the said District Court~~ writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Washington on the relation of McPherson Bros. Company,
Plaintiff in error,
1096 vs.
Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for Douglas County, and the Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Washington on the relation of McPherson Bros. Company,

Plaintiff in error,

1097 vs.

Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for Okanogan County and C. H. Neal, Judge, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,

Petitioner,

653 vs.

The State of Florida, ex rel. R. Hudson Burr, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, with leave to counsel, however, to file briefs as amici curiae in the cases of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. v. Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky, No. 872, and Standard Oil Co., Incorporated in Kentucky, v. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., No. 873.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

654 vs.

The State of Florida, ex rel., R. Hudson Burr, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied; with leave to counsel, however, to file briefs as amici curiae in the cases of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. v. Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky, No. 872, and Standard Oil Co., Incorporated in Kentucky, v. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., No. 873.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. H. Mason,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,
Petitioner,
791 vs.
Milton Dairy Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
801 vs.
W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading as Henry Marcus & Son.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. C. Tucker,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
1016 vs.
Oesterlein Machine Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia,
Petitioner,
1031 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. L. Becker & Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
1035 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
1036 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brimstone Railroad & Canal Company, Appellant,
1108 vs.
The United States of America,
Louisiana Western Railroad Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 26. Reba Fenwick, plaintiff in error, vs. Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting Attorney, Darke County, Ohio.

No. 332. The People of the State of New York ex rel. George C. Bryant, plaintiff in error, vs. Charles F. Zimmerman, Chief of Police of Buffalo, New York, et al.

No. 582. John P. Donnelley, vs. The United States of America.

No. 869. The United States of America, petitioner, vs. Ole Berkeness.

No. 930. Joseph E. Marron, petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

No. 960. Augustin Segurola and Manuel Santiago, petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

Rosario Gambino and Joseph Lima, Petitioners,
1071 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that these criminal cases upon the docket be, and they are hereby, advanced for argument on Monday, October 3 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1077 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
1079 vs.
City of Norfolk, H. W. Peatross, A. Plummer Pannill, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Ellison, William R. Ellison, and Howard B. Ellison, Jr., individually, et al.,
Petitioners,
1081 vs.
Max Koswig, trading as F. F. Koswig.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1087 vs.
Northside Belt Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co.,
Petitioner,
1115 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied

Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and Sheffield Car Company, Petitioners,
1143 vs.
American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York & Pennsylvania Railway Company, by Howard Cobb and Fordyce A. Cobb, Assignees, Petitioners,
1000 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Trust Company, Petitioner,
1050 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hammond Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Oscar Sandin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William V. Dwyer and Edward C. Cohron, Petitioners,
1075 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben B. Lindsey,
Petitioner,
1076 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado upon the complaint of Royal Graham and Charles L. Laney, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Succession Francisca de los Reyes Correa, et al., Petitioners, 1082 vs. William P. Kramer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Southern Sierras Power Company, Petitioner, 1083 vs. Arizona Edison Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. McKuen, Petitioner, 1084 vs. The City of Newark, Hugh F. Cook, Margaret Cook, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. McEuen,
Petitioner,
1085 vs.
Hugh P. Cook, Margaret Cook, Paul Burns, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. M. Joggle,
Petitioner,
1086 vs.
Fred Mansur, as Trustee in Bankruptcy for creditors of White Star Oil & Refining Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hidalgo County Water Improvement District No. 4,
Petitioner,
1089 vs.
Western Metal Manufacturing Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Leonard Van Norden,
Petitioner,
1093 vs.
Charles R. McCormick Lumber Company, of Delaware.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Wholesale Corporation,
Petitioner,
1094 vs.
Stephen Stone, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Steele Furniture Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. C. Steen and Edward R. Holmes and Ralph W. Holmes, partners doing business under the firm name etc., Petitioners,
1095 vs.
Viola LeFlore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris Druin,
Petitioner,
1099 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Dredging Company of New Jersey and Southern Casualty Company of Louisiana,
Petitioners,
1102 vs.
Carl Lindberg and Lawson Lindberg, by their next friend and mother, Mrs. G. Lindberg.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Myra L. Garland,
Petitioner,
1105.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Probate of the State of Maine.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Probate of the State of Maine and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company
and United States Fidelity &
Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
1106 vs.
Valeere Fountain, Administratrix of
Estate of Flex Fountain, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Union Fire Insurance
Company of New York,
Petitioner,
1109 vs.
G. L. Marshall, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
1110 vs.
G. L. Marshall, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Home Fire and Marine Insurance
Company of California,
Petitioner,
1111 vs.
G. L. Marshall, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Union Assurance
Company of London,
Petitioner,
1112 vs.
G. L. Marshall, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesse C. Adkins, Hugh B. Rowland,
Roger B. Whiteford, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
1114 vs.
Ignatius J. Costigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Broadway Trust Company, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1116 vs.
William L. Dill, Receiver of Hanover Farms Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Petroleum Steamship Company, as Owner of the S. S. "Westwego", Petitioner,
1120 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Petitioner,
1126 vs.
A. C. Lawrence Leather Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. K. Goree, Trustee of the
Estate of J. L. Walker, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
1130 vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee of the
Estate of Walker Grain Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur M. Abell, Temporary
Administrator of the Estate of
Adeline S. Abell,
Petitioner,
1137 vs.
Flora B. Thompson and George W.
White, Executors, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Frank Wood and J. Leigh
Nourse, Petitioners,
1139 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Frank Wood, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1140

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Colastie Andrus, joined pro forma by her husband, Sidney Andrus, S. Broussard, Laodis Broussard, et al., Petitioners, vs. F. M. Hutchinson, et al. 1142

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marcelle Smith, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1150

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mayor and Board of Alderman
of the City of Natchez,
Petitioners,
591 vs.
S. B. McNeely.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Louisa B. McNeely, Administratrix of the Estate of S. B. McNeely, deceased,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
The Mayor and Board of Aldermen
of the City of Natchez.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided, and all other business of the term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.